





ER

782

.G782

1861

1A

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF
SCOTLAND.

ABERDEEN: PRINTED BY ARTHUR KING AND CO.,

FOR

EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS, EDINBURGH.

LONDON . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

CAMBRIDGE . MACMILLAN AND CO.

GLASGOW . JAMES MACLEHOSE.

ABERDEEN . A. BROWN AND CO., AND

GEORGE DAVIDSON.

A N

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY TO
THE PRESENT TIME.

BY GEORGE GRUB, A.M.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.



EDINBURGH:

EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.

1861.

In compliance with current
copyright law, LBS Archival
Products produced this
replacement volume on paper
that meets the ANSI Standard
Z39.48-1984 to replace the
irreparably deteriorated
original.

1993



CONTENTS.

CHAPTER LXXVII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the death of King George I. in June, 1727, to the Synod of Edinburgh in August, 1743.

Accession of George the Second—Episcopal Synod of 1727—
Canons agreed to by the Synod—Proposals of accommodation
made by the Diocesan Bishops, and rejected by the College
Bishops—Andrew Lumsden chosen Bishop of Edinburgh—
Concordate of 1731—Death of Bishop Gadderar—Bishop Free-
bairn elected to the see of Edinburgh—Bishop Rattray ap-
pointed Primus—Mandate for an election to the see of Edin-
burgh refused by the Bishops—Death of Bishop Rattray—
Bishop Keith appointed Primus—Episcopal Synod of 1743—
Canons agreed to by the Synod, 1

CHAPTER LXXVIII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the Synod of Edinburgh in August, 1743, to the arrival of Prince Charles in Scotland in July, 1745.

Meeting of the clergy of Edinburgh—Their letter to the Bishops—
Their objections to the Canons of 1743—Account of the Scot-
tish Communion Office—Its gradual adoption by the clergy—
Declaration by the Bishops in regard to the English Liturgy
—Farther correspondence between the Bishops and the Edin-
burgh clergy—Arrival of Prince Charles in Scotland—State
of the Church during the first part of the reign of George the
Second, 20

CHAPTER LXXIX.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the arrival of Prince Charles in Scotland in July, 1745, to the death of King George II. in October, 1760.

The insurrection of 1745—Severe measures against the Episcopal Church—Penal Act of 1746—Penal Act of 1748—Debate in the House of Lords—The worship of the Church proscribed—Effect of the penal laws on the ritual of the Church—Diminished numbers of the Laity—Their religious character—Account of Alexander, Lord Pitsligo—Death of Bishop Keith—Bishop White appointed Primus—Death of King George the Second, 33

CHAPTER LXXX.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

From the Abjuration Act of April, 1719, to the Deposition of Ebenezer Erskine and the other Ministers of the Associate Presbytery in May, 1740.

Changes of opinion in the Presbyterian Church—Case of John Simson—Propositions drawn up by the Presbytery of Auchterarder—Republication of the Marrow of Modern Divinity—Controversy in connection with that work—Opinions of John Glass—He is deposed—Differences on the subject of Patronage—Act of Assembly of 1732 regarding Patronage—Sermon of Ebenezer Erskine—Erskine and three other ministers are suspended—They are deprived of their pastoral charges—Their Secession from the Established Church—They assume the name of the Associate Presbytery—They publish their Testimony—The General Assembly are desirous of an accommodation—The Associate Presbytery refuse to accept the proposed concessions—They publish the Judicial Testimony—They are deposed by the General Assembly, 49

CHAPTER LXXXI.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

From the Deposition of Ebenezer Erskine and the other Ministers of the Associate Presbytery in May, 1740, to the death of King George II. in October, 1760.

Dissensions among the Seceders—George Whitefield visits Scotland—His correspondence with the Seceders—His quarrel

with them—Revival at Cambuslang—John Wesley visits Scotland—Results of his preaching—The Seceders renew the Covenants—Differences among them as to the Burgess Oath—Their separation into Burghers and Antiburghers—Death of Ebenezer Erskine—Efforts of the established ministers to obtain an augmentation of their Stipends—The disputes regarding Patronage—Case of Inverkeithing—Deposition of Thomas Gillespie—Formation of the Relief Presbytery—Proposal in the General Assembly to censure the writings of David Hume—Proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts regarding John Home's Tragedy of Douglas—State of the Established Church at the end of the reign of George the Second, 67

CHAPTER LXXXII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the death of King George II. in October, 1760, to the repeal of the Penal Laws in June, 1792.

Accession of George the Third—Favourable change in the position of the Church—Bishop Falconer appointed Primus—A new edition of the Communion Office—The English Nonjurors—Bishop Kilgour appointed Primus—Dr. Seabury elected Bishop by the clergy of Connecticut—He applies to the Scottish Bishops for consecration—He is consecrated at Aberdeen—Concordate between the Scottish Bishops and Dr. Seabury—Address of the clergy of Connecticut to their Bishop—Bishop Skinner appointed Primus—Character of Bishop Petrie—Death of Prince Charles—The Bishops and clergy acknowledge King George—Attempt to obtain a repeal of the penal laws—It is at first unsuccessful—Convention of the clergy and laity at Laurencekirk—The penal laws are repealed—Restrictions imposed on the Scottish clergy, . . . 86

CHAPTER LXXXIII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the repeal of the Penal Laws in June, 1792, to the death of King George III. in January, 1820.

Second Convention of the clergy and laity at Laurencekirk—Proposal to appoint Jonathan Boucher to the see of Edinburgh

Opinions of the Hutchinsonians—Consecration of Bishop Jolly—Convocation of the clergy at Laurencekirk—Speech of Bishop Jolly—The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England adopted—Articles of Union offered to the clergy of English ordination—Election and consecration of Dr. Sandford to the see of Edinburgh—Episcopal Synod at Aberdeen—Synod of the Bishops and clergy at Aberdeen—Canons agreed to by the Synod—Death of Bishop Skinner—Bishop Gleig appointed Primus—Death of King George the Third, 110

CHAPTER LXXXIV.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

From the death of King George II. in October, 1760, to the passing of the Act of Assembly respecting unqualified Ministers and Preachers in May, 1799.

Account of Dr. William Robertson and Dr. John Erskine—State of parties in the General Assembly—Discussion of the Overture on Schism—Ascendency of the moderate party—Proposed repeal of the penal laws against Roman Catholics—Popular excitement on the subject—Act of Assembly regarding persons applying for licence to preach, or for ordination beyond the bounds of the Church—Dr. Robertson retires from the Assembly—Character of his ecclesiastical influence—Eminent members of the Established Church at Aberdeen—Case of Dr. M'Gill of Ayr—Proceedings of the Seceders—Commemoration of the Revolution of 1688—The French Revolution of 1789—Act of Assembly prohibiting persons not licensed to preach, or ordained by the Established Church, from holding benefices or preaching in Scotland, 137

CHAPTER LXXXV.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

From the passing of the Act of Assembly respecting unqualified Ministers and Preachers in May, 1799, to the death of King George IV. in June, 1830.

Increasing influence of the popular party in the Established Church—Question as to Pluralities—The Leslie Controversy—Renewed attempt to obtain an augmentation of the minis-

ters' stipends—Speech of Dr. Carlyle—Communication from the Synod of Ulster—Dispute as to Prayers for the Royal Family—Mission to the East Indies—Proceedings in the Secession Church—Changes of opinion among the Seceders—New Testimony adopted by the Antiburgher Synod—Deposition of Mr. M'Crie and other members—Formation of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery—Overture laid before the Burgher Synod—Formation of the Associate Presbytery—Proposal to unite the Burgher and Antiburgher Synods—Basis of Union adopted—Ratification of the Union—Formation of the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church—Progress of Congregationalism in Scotland—Robert and James Haldane—The Haldanes join the Baptist communion—Formation of the Congregational Union of Scotland, 152

CHAPTER LXXXVI.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the death of King George III. in January, 1820, to the Synod of Edinburgh in August and September, 1838.

Address of the Scottish Bishops to King George the Fourth—Puritanical opinions again appear in Edinburgh—Bishop Hobart visits Scotland—His interview with Bishop Jolly at Aberdeen—Dean Skinner's letter regarding the admission of the laity to a share in the government of the Church—Consecration of Bishop Luscombe—Calvinistic teaching of Mr. Edward Craig—Declaration by the clergy presented to the Bishops—Synod of Laurencekirk in 1828—Canons agreed to by the Synod—Objections of Bishop Jolly—Synod of Edinburgh in 1829—Death of Bishop Sandford—Dr. Walker elected Bishop of Edinburgh—Address of the Scottish Bishops to King William the Fourth—Sympathy of the Scottish Prelates with the ecclesiastical movement in England—Bishop Walker appointed Primus—Death of Bishop Jolly—His character—Synod of Edinburgh in 1838—Canons agreed to by the Synod, 172

CHAPTER LXXXVII.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

From the death of King George IV. in June, 1830, to the General Assembly in May, 1840.

Account of Edward Irving—His doctrines censured by the General Assembly—He is deposed—Deposition of Mr Campbell—

Controversy regarding Ecclesiastical Establishments—Account of Dr. Thomas Chalmers—Renewed struggle between the two parties in the Church—Discussions in the General Assembly of 1833—General Assembly of 1834—The Veto Act—Act regarding Chapels of Ease—Disputed settlement in the parish of Auchterarder—Decision of the Court of Session—Resolution of the General Assembly regarding the jurisdiction of the Church—Decision of the House of Lords in the Auchterarder case—Measures of the popular party—Commemoration of the Glasgow Assembly of 1638—General Assembly of 1839—Discussion regarding the Veto Act—The Original Burgher Synod joins the Established Church—The Lethendy case—The Marnoch case—The majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie are suspended by the General Assembly—Conflict between the civil and the ecclesiastical courts—Application to the Government and the Legislature—General Assembly of 1840, 196

CHAPTER LXXXVIII.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

From the General Assembly of May, 1840, to the Union of the Secession and Relief Churches in May, 1847.

The Marnoch settlement—General Assembly of 1841—Debate regarding the Strathbogie ministers—Speech of Mr. Cunningham—The Strathbogie ministers are deposed—Continuance of the struggle—General Assembly of 1842—The Act of 1799 repealed—The Declaration and Protest, and Claim of Right—Convocation of ministers—Appeal to the Government—Preparations for a Secession—General Assembly of 1843—Speech of Dr. Welsh—The Protest—The Disruption—The Veto Act rescinded—The Strathbogie ministers are restored—Lord Aberdeen's Act—The Free Church—Death of Dr. Chalmers—The Secession Church—Death of Dr. M'Crie—Proposals for a Union of the Associate Synod and the Relief Synod—The Basis of Union—The United Presbyterian Church, 216

CHAPTER LXXXIX.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the Synod of Edinburgh in August and September, 1838, to the rejection of Mr. Pulmer's Appeal in September, 1849.

The Scottish Episcopal Church Society—Communication from the American Church—Death of Bishop Gleig—Act of Parliament

of 1840 in regard to the Scottish and American clergy—Death of Bishop Walker—Bishop Skinner appointed Primus—Establishment of Trinity College, Glenalmond—Schism of Mr. Drummond and Sir William Dunbar—Declaration by the Scottish Bishops—Agitation against the Communion Office—Restoration of the see of St. Andrews—Re-erection of the see of Argyll and the Isles—Mr. Palmer comes to Aberdeen with letters commendatory from Bishop Luscombe—Objects of his mission—Mr. Palmer proceeds to Russia—His discussions with the Russian clergy—He returns to Scotland—Death of Bishop Luscombe—Mr. Palmer prepares his appeal—His appeal favourably received by the Diocesan Synod of St. Andrews—It is laid before the other Diocesan Synods—Its rejection by the Episcopal Synod, 241

CHAPTER XC.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From the rejection of Mr. Palmer's Appeal in September, 1849, to the death of Bishop Skinner in April, 1857.

The Gorham Case—Declaration by the Scottish Bishops—The St. Andrews Prayer-Book—It is censured by the Bishops—Bishop Torry's Memorial—Improvements in Ritual—Bishop Forbes's Protest against Papal Intrusion—The Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Act—Mr. Gladstone's letter on the functions of Laymen in the Church—Resolution of the Episcopal Synod—Resolutions of the Diocesan Synods—Death of Bishop Torry—Death of Bishop Skinner, 263

APPENDIX, 281

INDEX, 289

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.

CHAPTER LXXVII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING GEORGE I. IN JUNE, 1727, TO THE SYNOD OF
EDINBURGH IN AUGUST, 1743.

*Accession of George the Second—Episcopal Synod of 1727—
Canons agreed to by the Synod—Proposals of accommoda-
tion made by the Diocesan Bishops, and rejected by the
College Bishops—Andrew Lumsden chosen Bishop of
Edinburgh—Concordate of 1731—Death of Bishop Gad-
derar—Bishop Freebairn elected to the see of Edinburgh—
Bishop Rattray appointed Primus—Mandate for an election
to the see of Edinburgh refused by the Bishops—Death of
Bishop Rattray—Bishop Keith appointed Primus—Epis-
copal Synod of 1743—Canons agreed to by the Synod.*

THE accession of George the Second, son of the late king, made no change in the ecclesiastical policy of the government.

In June, 1727, an episcopal synod was held at Edinburgh. It was attended by the new Primus, Bishop Millar, and by the Bishops of Aberdeen, Brechin, and Murray; and the following canons were agreed to:—

“I. Seeing there can be no order or unity in any national or provincial Church without a Metropolitan, that all bishops and clergy do own the metropolitan powers to be lodged in the Bishop of Edinburgh, during the vacancy of the see of St. Andrews, as being vicar-general thereof.

"II. Seeing all councils or assemblies of bishops are intended principally for deliberating upon and regulating the affairs of the flock of Christ respectively committed to them, that none have a decisive vote in these councils or assemblies but such bishops only as have a part of this flock committed to them by an election from the presbyters thereof, confirmed by the Metropolitan, with consent of the local comprovincial bishops.

"III. Seeing the consecrating of bishops at large is contrary to the canons and practice of the Church, and not to be excused but from an urgent necessity in some particular and rarely occurring circumstances, that henceforth none be consecrated into that order but such as shall be regularly elected to a particular diocese or district by a majority of the presbyters of that diocese or district; and these consecrations to be performed by the Metropolitan or his order, with the consent of the local bishops of the province, unless such urgent necessity shall happen (which God forbid), of which necessity the Metropolitan or local bishops are to be judges.

"IV. To prevent any confusions or disputes which may arise otherwise about the election of a bishop, each diocesan or local bishop shall appoint in his diocese or district one of the presbyters who shall be in the place or stead of a dean, and as such shall have power, whenever a vacancy shall happen therein, to convene his fellow-presbyters in one or more meetings, and to require their votes for that effect, or to take their subscriptions separately, if that shall be found more expedient, and to return the deed of election to the Metropolitan, in order to the consecration of the elect.

"V. That no bishop shall take upon him, contrary to the canons of the Church, to perform any episcopal function within the diocese or district of another bishop, without his consent and allowance.

"VI. That whosoever shall be hereafter elected to any diocese or district, shall be obliged to subscribe the five canons or rules above set down, immediately before his consecration or confirmation to the said diocese or district."¹

¹ MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, p. 13. There can be no doubt that Bishop Keith, coadjutor to the Primus in the see of Edinburgh, was present at the synod, but, in conformity with the principles there laid down,

These few canons, the groundwork of the code by which the Scottish Episcopal Church is still governed, mark the first attempt to establish a formal ecclesiastical system, on the principles for which Gadderar, Rattray, and their friends, had been contending. Circumstances favoured the endeavour at this time. All connection with the state was at an end; the temporal privileges which had been partially enjoyed for many years after the Revolution were now the exclusive possession of another communion; and the Church remained apart, with a polity distinctly separated, and its ministers and members occupying their own proper position. There was little real danger except from internal dissension; but for some time there was no prospect of a change for the better in that respect.

The prelates who drew up the canons wished to establish a strict diocesan episcopacy, in which one of their number, with the authority of a Metropolitan, not simply as Primus, should hold the chief place, and the others, in their several districts, should be the real, and almost the sole, governors of the Church. This system was better than any which had yet been proposed; but it was defective in giving little power to the presbyters, and in being silent altogether as to the privileges of the laity in episcopal elections, for which Rattray had once contended so strenuously. On the other hand, the college bishops, as the opposite party were called, still clung to the royal supremacy, and were anxious to continue that anomalous system, on which they had acted for some years, of governing the whole Church by an episcopal college, which itself derived its power of jurisdiction from the exiled prince. If there were weak points in the plan of the diocesan bishops, that of their opponents was void of any element of strength or duration.

The personal qualities of the college bishops were of little avail in supplying the defects of their system: with the exception of Gillan, they were not distinguished for learning or ability. Among the diocesan bishops, Gadderar, Rattray, and Keith, were in every respect worthy of their

he took no authoritative part. The signatures to the canons were the following:—"Arth. Edinburgen.; Jacobus, Episcopus Aberdonensis; T. Rattray, Ep. Brechinensis; Gul. Ep. Moravien."

office. The main points in the life of the first of these three prelates have already been referred to—his original position as a parochial incumbent in a district where the most extreme Presbyterianism was the general belief; his subsequent residence at London, and friendship with the leading persons among the English Nonjurors; the share which he had in the negotiation with the Eastern bishops; and the able administration of his northern diocese, which was now as much attached to the doctrine and ritual of the Church, as it had always been to its polity. Bishop Rattray, inferior, perhaps, in his capacity for government, was yet more distinguished than Gadderar for his theological learning and acquirements. He was the head of an ancient family in Perthshire, and had become well known by his ecclesiastical writings while still a layman. The exact date of his ordination to the priesthood does not seem to be recorded, but it must have been after he attained a mature age. Bishop Keith cannot be ranked so high as the other two. His abilities, however, were considerable, and his principles were orthodox and uncompromising. Descended from a branch of the family of the Earls Marischal, he was educated at the college in Aberdeen which had been founded by a chief of his house; and, for some time, he acted as preceptor to Earl George, and to his brother James, afterwards the famous Field-Marshal Keith. He was ordained deacon by Bishop Haliburton of Aberdeen in 1710, and raised to the priesthood by the same prelate in 1713; and for some years before his consecration he officiated as pastor of one of the congregations in Edinburgh.¹

Immediately after the synod at Edinburgh, the diocesan bishops sent to their brethren the following proposals for an accommodation:—

“I. Seeing there can be no order or unity preserved in any national or provincial Church without a Metropolitan, that all do own Bishop Millar for Bishop of Edinburgh, and that, as vicar-general of the now vacant see of St. Andrews, the metropolitan powers are lodged in him.

¹ In regard to the early life of Bishop Keith, see Bishop Russell's *Memoir*, prefixed to his edition of the *Historical Catalogue*; and Mr. Lawson's *Memoir*, prefixed to the Spottiswood Society edition of the *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*.

“II. Seeing all assemblies of bishops are intended principally for deliberating upon and regulating the affairs of the flock of Christ respectively committed to them, it is evident none can have a decisive vote but such bishops as have a *portio gregis*, a part of Christ’s flock entrusted to them.

“III. The Bishop of Edinburgh and his other comprovincial bishops are willing to maintain good correspondence with such bishops as have no part of the flock committed to them, but are only bishops at large, to call them to their meetings, and ask their advice on weighty matters; and, if any of them shall have particular charges, *i.e.* dioceses or districts, committed to them, by a regular election from a competent number of presbyters, confirmed by the comprovincial bishops, they will then come to have a right to a decisive vote in affairs relating to the general benefit of the Church.

“Upon the above terms, which are plainly necessary for preserving order in the Church, the Bishop of Edinburgh is ready, in his own name, and in the name of his comprovincial bishops, cordially to embrace their brethren, all or any of the bishops at large, who shall agree to them. And forasmuch as it is informed that groundless clamours are industriously spread concerning some usages of the primitive Church, the Bishop of Edinburgh, and the other diocesan or local bishops, think fit hereby to declare that they shall not disturb the peace of this Church by any alterations in the public worship, or by introducing anything into it which has not formerly been allowed and practised.”

The college bishops not only declined to accede to these proposals, but, after making a formal act annulling the election of Bishop Millar to the see of Edinburgh, cited that prelate to appear before them, to answer for his conduct; and, on his disregarding their citation, they suspended him from his functions, and appointed Bishop Freebairn to the superintendence of the diocese, till a regular election should take place. They further declared the election of Bishop Rattray and Bishop Dunbar to be null and void; their consecration to be irregular and uncanonical; and themselves to be no bishops of the Scottish Church and to have no power or jurisdiction as such. And the clergy were also forbidden to yield any obedience to these prelates, until they should appear before the

College of Bishops when cited, and give satisfaction to the lawful governors of the Church, particularly by obliging themselves not to encourage or use in public worship the usages, prayers for the dead, and the like, which had disturbed the peace of the Church, and caused great scandal to most of the Reformed both in Scotland and elsewhere.

Matters continued in this distracted state during the brief primacy of Bishop Millar. He died on the ninth of October, and, on the nineteenth of the same month, the clergy of Edinburgh, including two of the college bishops, Ranken and Gillan, met to elect a bishop for the diocese. Their choice fell on Andrew Lumsden, an aged presbyter who had recently acted as archdeacon, and who had been minister at Duddingston before the Revolution. The bishop-elect was consecrated at Edinburgh, on the second of November, by Bishops Rattray, Cant, and Keith. On the following day, Bishop Rattray and Bishop Keith waited upon him, and requested him to subscribe the canons of June, by which he himself, as Bishop of Edinburgh, was declared to be vicar-general; but he declined to do so, stating that he viewed his own election as a measure designed by both parties to promote the peace of the Church, and that, since the metropolitan powers claimed by his predecessors had given great offence to the college bishops, he would not exercise them, though he would not prejudice the rights of his successors by giving them up.¹

Bishop Ranken died in 1728, and Bishop Cant in 1730. For several years nothing of importance took place. The two parties stood aloof, while the Bishop of Edinburgh attempted to occupy a middle position between them. The influence of the diocesan bishops continued to increase; and their opponents, at last, finding that there was no chance of regaining their former superiority, and perhaps convinced of the irregular character of the system which they had hitherto maintained,

¹ MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, pp. 13-16, 35. *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, pp. 531, 532. Rattray's *Essay on the Church*, p. 243. Dundas's *Supplement*, preface, pp. xii. xiii. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 645. Keith's *Catalogue*, p. 527. Wodrow mentions (*History* vol. iii. pp. 303, 304) that, among the ministers of the diocese of Edinburgh who opposed the Test of 1681, was Andrew Lumsden, minister of Duddingston, although he finally submitted to that obnoxious enactment.

became willing to discuss terms of reconciliation. Conferences were held between Bishop Keith on the one side, and Bishop Gillan on the other, and, in December, 1731, the following concordate was drawn up :—

“ Articles of Agreement amongst the Bishops of the Church of Scotland.

“ I. That we shall only make use of the Scottish or English Liturgy in the public divine service ; nor shall we disturb the peace of the Church by introducing into the public worship any of the ancient usages, concerning which there has been lately a difference amongst us : and that we shall censure any of our clergy who shall act otherwise.

“ II. That hereafter, no man shall be consecrated a bishop of this Church, without the consent and approbation of the majority of the other bishops.

“ III. That upon the demise or removal elsewhere of a bishop of any district, the presbyters thereof shall neither elect nor submit to another bishop, without a mandate from the Primus, by consent of the other bishops.

“ IV. That the bishops of this Church shall, by a majority of voices, choose their Primus, for convocating and presiding only ; and that no bishop shall claim jurisdiction without the bounds of his own district.

“ V. We, the bishops of the Church of Scotland, have chosen and appointed Bishop Freebairn to be our Primus, for convocating and presiding only, according to the fourth article of agreement.

“ VI. We, the bishops of the Church of Scotland, have agreed that the diocese of Glasgow shall be under the inspection of Bishop Duncan, excepting only Annandale, Nithsdale, and Tweeddale, which shall be under the inspection of Bishop Freebairn, together with the diocese of Galloway, by way of district ; that the diocese of Dunblane, by way of district, shall be under the inspection of Bishop Gillan ; that the shires of Fife, Kinross, and Clackmannan, shall be under the inspection of Bishop Rose ; that the diocese of Dunkeld, together with the whole presbyteries of Meigle and Forfar, and the town of Perth, shall be under the inspection of Bishop Rattray ; that the diocese of Brechin, together with the Carse of Gowrie, the presbyteries of Dundee, Arbroath, and Mearns, shall be

under the inspection of Bishop Ochterlonie ; that the diocese of Aberdeen, by way of district, shall be under the inspection of Bishop Gadderar ; that the dioceses of Murray and Ross shall, by way of district, be under the inspection of Bishop Dunbar ; that the diocese of Edinburgh shall, by way of district only, be under the inspection of Bishop Lumsden ; that Orkney, Caithness, and the Isles, shall be under the inspection of Bishop Keith. By the foresaid division of districts, we do not pretend to claim any legal title to dioceses."

Another article was also agreed to, but for obvious prudential reasons was not included in the formal written concordate. It was to the effect that, as on the one hand no person was to be recommended by the Chevalier for consecration, so on the other no bishop was to be consecrated without previous intimation to him. The first three articles were signed by all the bishops ; the others by all except Bishop Lumsden, who declined to consent to the abolition of the office of Metropolitan, which had been declared to be essential to the preservation of unity and order. It was on this account, probably, that the office of Primus was taken from him, and transferred to Bishop Freebairn. The conduct of the diocesan prelates, in regard to the office of a Metropolitan, seems hardly to have been consistent with their former proceedings.¹

The year 1733 was marked by the death of several of the prelates. Bishop Duncan died in January ; Bishop Gadderar in February ; Bishop Rose in April ; and Bishop Lumsden in June. Dr. Gadderar was buried in Bishop Scougal's grave, within the ancient cathedral of his see ; and we are told that, on the following Sunday, the members of the Church in Old and New Aberdeen made an offering, from which his little debts were paid, and the charges of his funeral defrayed. Dr. George Garden, the biographer of John Forbes and the friend

¹ MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, pp. 16, 17, 36, 37. *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, p. 532. Skinner, vol. ii. pp. 645-647. Chambers's *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, vol. iii. p. 621. Letter, Bishop Keith to Bishop Rattray, 4th December, 1731, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. No. K. 23, of the Catalogue. There had been an earlier arrangement of districts soon after the election of Bishop Fullarton to the see of Edinburgh, in terms of which the Merse was assigned to Bishop Millar, Dunblane to Bishop Irvine, and Annandale to Bishop Freebairn ; see Dundas's *Supplement*, p. 223, and *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, p. 522.

of Henry Scougal, died a few days before his bishop, in the eighty-fifth year of his age.¹

On the tenth of July, 1733, Bishop Keith was elected by the clergy of Fife to the superintendence of that district, in room of Bishop Rose; but he still retained the administration of Orkney, Caithness, and the Isles, and continued as before to reside at Edinburgh. The district of Glasgow remained vacant after the death of Bishop Duncan. On the fifth of June, the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen met at Old Meldrum, and made choice of Bishop Dunbar as their bishop, who accepted of the office, and about two years afterwards resigned the sees of Murray and Ross. On the twenty-eighth of June, the clergy of the diocese of Edinburgh met, in terms of a mandate from Bishop Freebairn as Primus, and that prelate himself was elected bishop.²

Bishop Gillan died on the third of January, 1735. During his latter years he had acted in concert with Bishop Rattray and those who held similar opinions, rather than with the Primus and Bishop Ochterlonie. Harmony had never been entirely restored between the two parties. The Primus complained of attempts to introduce the forbidden usages, notwithstanding the concordate; while his opponents had to guard against a renewal of the secular influence formerly prevalent in the Episcopal College, which the Primus sought to re-establish by means of the exiled prince and his ministers.

The clergy of Dunblane having made choice of Robert White, a presbyter at Cupar in Fife, as successor to Bishop Gillan, the Primus refused to confirm the election; but the new bishop was consecrated at Carsebank, near Forfar, on St.

¹ *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, p. 523. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 648. Letter from Bishop Gerard, quoted by Mr. Cheyne in his *Vindication of the Scottish Communion Office*, p. 27. The date of Dr. George Garden's decease is mentioned in the inscription on his tombstone in the churchyard of St. Machar. In 1703, Dr. Gadderar published at London a translation of Sir Thomas Craig's Latin treatise on the Succession to the English Crown, in answer to Parsons the Jesuit; see Tytler's *Life of Craig*, p. 178, and Irving's *Life of Buchanan*, p. 254.

² MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, p. 17. *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, p. 533. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 648. Russell's *Life of Bishop Keith*, p. xxix. Deed of election of Bishop Keith to the district of Fife, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, No. N. 14, of the Catalogue.

John the Baptist's day, by Bishop Rattray, now styled Bishop of Dunkeld, Bishop Dunbar of Aberdeen, and Bishop Keith. This produced a formal remonstrance from Bishops Freebairn and Ochterlonie.¹

The dissensions which now took place almost led to an entire separation between the two parties. The Primus having issued a mandate to the clergy of Murray and Ross to elect a bishop, they met at Elgin, in July, 1737, and made choice of George Hay, a presbyter of Murray. The disputes among the bishops delayed his consecration, and he died about the end of the same year. The appointment of additional bishops was also proposed, but was prevented by the opposition of one or other of the contending parties.

In July of the following year, an episcopal synod was held at Edinburgh, to which the Bishop of Aberdeen sent a presbyter, named Robert Lyon, with authority to act as his proxy. The Primus and Bishop Ochterlonie objected to this unusual act; and, when the other prelates supported it, they left the meeting, and declined to take any farther part in its proceedings. On their repeated refusal to concur with their brethren, the majority of the bishops appointed Bishop Rattray to act as Primus in room of Bishop Freebairn. So far as the documents which have been preserved afford an opportunity of judging, the bishops in the majority seem to have been hasty and overbearing, and disposed to make the authority of the Episcopal College an instrument of oppression against their opponents, as it had formerly been against themselves. More serious differences were perhaps only prevented by the death of Bishop Freebairn, which took place on the twenty-fourth of December, 1739.²

¹ MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, p. 19. *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, p. 534. Skinner, vol. ii. pp. 648, 649. See also a treatise published in 1767, entitled "*Principles Political and Religious, or a Preservative against Innovations in Politics and Religion*," written by Norman Sievwright, a qualified clergyman of the Church of England officiating at Brechin, p. 286-288. Bishop Gillan was the author of several works—a *Life of Bishop Sage*, a *Vindication of that writer's Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, and *Remarks on Sir James Dalrymple's Historical Collections*. It was also reported that he was the real author of Lockhart's *Memoirs concerning the Affairs of Scotland*. See Keith's *Catalogue*, p. 567, and Wodrow's *Analecta*, as quoted by Lawson, p. 251.

² MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, p. 19-22. *Memoirs of*

The clergy of Edinburgh met two days after the death of their bishop. One of their number, William Harper, produced an authority from the late Primus, appointing him guardian of the spiritualities, during a vacancy of the see, with power to act as dean, and to summon an assembly of his fellow presbyters to apply for a mandate to elect a bishop. The clergy disregarded this authority, but, by their own act, appointed the person who had received it to preside at their meeting. They agreed to notify the death of their bishop to each of his colleagues, and to request a mandate for the election of a successor. Bishop Rattray continued to act as Primus; but the clergy of Edinburgh probably doubted the validity of his appointment, and, on that account, addressed the prelates individually. They received no answer to their application till the beginning of April, when they were informed that the bishops must hold a synod before a mandate could be issued. On the seventeenth of April, the clergy again met, and sent a second address to each of the bishops, but no answer was returned. They complained of this treatment, asserting that a resolution had been taken to deprive them of their undoubted privilege of electing their own bishop, and referring to the former proceedings of the bishops themselves, when they maintained the rights of presbyters against the authority of those who then composed the Episcopal College.

The bishops disliked the independent proceedings of the Edinburgh clergy, and were probably apprehensive of the choice which they would make in the event of a mandate being issued; but these circumstances are not sufficient to explain their conduct. The true cause is mentioned in their own confidential correspondence. After the concordate of 1731, they had obtained permission from the Chevalier to keep up the episcopal succession, and to appoint bishops to such districts, not exceeding seven in number, as they might select, without consulting him; but it was agreed that the metropolitan sees

the Affairs of the Episcopal Church—appendix to Lawson, p. 535. Sievwright's Principles, p. 289-291. The author of the MS. Memoirs asserts that the consecration of the Bishop-elect of Murray was prevented by Bishops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith; but this statement is inconsistent with what is mentioned in the letters of these prelates, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland; see Nos. I. 24, 25; J. 1, 9, 39-44; and N. 17, of the Catalogue.

of St. Andrews and Glasgow should remain vacant, and that no election should take place for Edinburgh, unless with his express consent. James and his advisers declined to sanction any appointment to Edinburgh, on account of the differences which existed among the bishops and clergy themselves; and the prelates in consequence could neither issue a mandate, nor venture to make known the real cause of the delay. Had Bishop Rattray and those who acted with him adhered steadfastly to their original principle of ecclesiastical independence, they would have avoided the reproaches to which they were now deservedly exposed.¹

The reasons which prevented an election at Edinburgh did not apply to the case of other dioceses. At the request of Bishop Keith and the clergy of Caithness and Orkney, William Falconer, a presbyter at Forres, was appointed Bishop-coadjutor of those districts. The new prelate was consecrated at Alloa, on the tenth of September, 1741, by the Primus, Bishop Keith, and Bishop White. It is said that Bishop Ochterlonie protested against the consecration. In November of the following year, Bishop Falconer was elected by the clergy of Murray, and, with consent of the Episcopal College, accepted the charge of that diocese.

Bishop Ochterlonie died in May, 1742; and the clergy of Brechin, having soon afterwards received a mandate from the Primus to elect a successor, made choice of James Rait, a presbyter at Dundee, who was consecrated at Edinburgh, on the fourth of October, by the Primus, Bishop Keith, and Bishop White. It was at first proposed that the consecration should take place in his own meeting-house at Dundee, for the sake of greater solemnity. This design was abandoned; but the fact of such a proposal having been made shews that there had been a great change for the better in the external condition of the Church, since the reign of Queen Anne, when it was necessary to observe the utmost secrecy in regard to the consecrations, and when even the preliminary correspondence of the prelates

¹ MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, pp. 22, 23. *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, p. 536. Letters, King James to the Scottish Bishops, and letter, Bishop Rattray to Bishop Keith, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, Nos. F. 17, 19, 32; and J. 52, of the Catalogue.

on the subject was carried on in a way which would have been unintelligible to those who did not know what it referred to.¹

Wearied by the long delay which had taken place, the clergy of Edinburgh, in February, 1743, applied to the Bishop of Dunkeld, as Primus, to take the temporary charge of the diocese until a bishop should be regularly chosen. Dr. Rattray returned a favourable answer, expressing a hope that he would be able to satisfy them on the subject. He went to Edinburgh for the purpose of holding an episcopal synod, but was taken ill soon afterwards, and died on the twelfth of May, being Ascension Day, in the sixtieth year of his age. Bishop Rattray was one of the most learned prelates of his time, and was himself an example of the primitive piety and strictness which he laboured to restore among the clergy and people committed to his charge. The only stain on his episcopal character is the part which he took, in his later years, in suppressing those rights of the presbyters for which he had at one time been so zealous an advocate.²

John Alexander, a presbyter at Alloa, having been elected bishop by the clergy of the diocese of Dunkeld, was consecrated at Edinburgh, on the nineteenth of August, 1743, by Bishops Keith, White, Falconer, and Rait. As all the bishops of the Church, except the Bishop of Aberdeen, were now assembled together, it was agreed, with consent of the last mentioned prelate, to hold an episcopal synod. On this occasion Bishop Keith was elected Primus, and thereupon resigned the district of Fife, but still retained the superintendence of Caithness, Orkney, and the Isles.

Several canons had been prepared by the late Primus: these were now submitted to the synod, and, with some additional regulations, were approved of, and received the unani-

¹ Bishop Falconer's deed of consecration, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, not numbered in the Catalogue. MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, p. 23. *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, p. 536. Skinner, vol. ii. pp. 653, 654. *Sievwright's Principles*, p. 291. Letter, Bishop Rattray to Bishop Keith, 8th September, 1742, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, No. J. 83, of the Catalogue.

² MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, pp. 23, 24. *Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church*—appendix to Lawson, pp. 536, 537. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 654. An account of Dr. Rattray's works is given by Dr. Russell, in his appendix to Keith's Catalogue, p. 537-539.

mous sanction of the bishops, as a code of canons for the government of the Church. The preamble to the code thus enacted, and the canons, sixteen in number, were the following:—

“The Bishops of the Church of Scotland being now, by the good providence of God, perfectly united in one and the same mind, and the concordates, that were formed while some unhappy differences subsisted amongst them, thereby vacated, they have unanimously agreed to establish the following canons for the future regulation of the government of this Church.

“I. That no person shall be consecrated a bishop, without the consent and approbation of the majority of the bishops; and that if any three or more bishops, not being a majority, shall take upon them, without such consent, to consecrate any person to that office, such consecration shall be null and void, and both the consecrators and consecrated shall be holden as schismatics.

“II. That the bishops shall, without respect either to seniority of consecration or precedency of district, choose a Primus by majority of voices, who shall have no other privilege among the bishops, but of convocating and presiding only, and that likewise under the following restrictions:—first, That he shall always be obliged to notify to the other bishops the reasons of his calling a meeting, as well as the time and place; and, if the majority shall dissent, as judging either the reasons insufficient, or the time and place improper, that meeting shall be either wholly set aside, or the time and place altered, as shall seem to them most expedient; secondly, That if the Primus shall at any time refuse to call a meeting, when desired by a majority of the other bishops, they shall in that case have power to meet and act synodically without him; and, thirdly, The Primus, thus chosen by the majority, is to continue in that office only during their pleasure.

“III. That if either the present or any subsequent Primus shall, in the present situation of the Church, lay claim to any metropolitical or vicarial power, or to any farther power of any kind than what is granted to the Primus by these present canons, the Primus or bishop so claiming shall be suspended from all episcopal jurisdiction, even within his own district, until he give in to the bishops a subscribed renunciation of any

such claim, as being what may prove of most dangerous consequence to the Church in her present circumstances.

“IV. That, upon the demise or translation of any bishop, the presbyters of the district thereby become vacant shall not be at freedom either to elect, or submit themselves to, another bishop, without a mandate from the Primus, with the majority of the bishops : but, if the Primus shall refuse to grant a mandate, the majority may do it without him.

“V. That, if the presbyters of any district shall happen to elect a person already vested with the episcopal character, the bishop so elected shall have no jurisdiction over that district, until his election be confirmed by the majority of the bishops : and, if they shall elect a presbyter, of whose fitness for that office the bishops shall declare they have sufficient reasons not to be satisfied, in that case the presbyters shall be required by the bishops to proceed to a new election.

“VI. That every bishop shall appoint one of his presbyters to officiate under him as his dean, and that this dean shall be obliged to advertise the Primus upon the death of his bishop, that the bishops may provide for the supply of the vacancy with their conveniency : and the dean shall apply for a mandate to elect a successor, in the space of four months at farthest after the vacancy.

“VII. That, during the vacancy of any district, the presbyters thereof shall apply to the bishop who shall have his place of residence nearest to them, for the performance of episcopal offices amongst them ; and no other bishop shall take upon him to perform any such offices, within that district, without the consent of the neighbouring bishop : and if any case relating to discipline shall happen, for which the presbyters had no rule left them by their former bishop for their direction, they shall have recourse to the Primus, who, with the advice and consent of his colleagues, shall determine the same.

“VIII. That no presbyter shall take upon him the charge of any congregation, until he be appointed thereto by the bishop to whose district that congregation belongs ; nor shall any presbyter or deacon remove from his own district, without dimissory letters from the bishop thereof : and none shall be ordained a presbyter without a designation to a particular charge.

“IX. That seeing, in the present distressed state of this Church, it may happen that a bishop may have his dwelling and place for public worship within the district of another bishop, in that case, those who belong to this his congregation, together with the presbyters or deacons joined with him as his assistants in officiating therein, shall be as much under his jurisdiction, as if they were within the bounds of his own district, and shall be exempt from the jurisdiction of that bishop, within the bounds of whose district they are: and the bishop in whose district they are shall, by a subscribed deed, agree to this regulation.

“X. That every bishop shall be careful to recommend to his clergy, and to such also as may be candidates for holy orders, to apply themselves diligently to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and of the Fathers of the apostolical and two next succeeding ages, and to take all proper opportunities, in their sermons and otherwise, to instruct their people in the truly Catholic principles of that pure and primitive Church.

“XI. That the dean of every district, as representing the presbyters, shall be allowed to sit in all synodical meetings, to propose and reason in all matters of discipline, and grievances of presbyters, but not to give any decisive voice. The clergy of vacant districts shall be required to choose a dean out of their own number; and the said dean, so chosen, shall not be allowed to name a proxy, but must attend in person, and bring with him his credentials.

“XII. That the Church may suffer as little damage as possible by the death of the temporary Primus, the senior bishop shall instantly succeed to his powers until the next synod. And he shall be obliged to call a synod, so as it may be holden within the space of four months at farthest after the death of the former Primus, unless the majority of the bishops shall think fit to delay it for a longer space.

“XIII. That, when any of the bishops are disabled from being personally present at a synod, through infirmity or pressing inconvenience, to be notified to the Primus, and by him to the other bishops, the absent bishop or bishops may send their judgment to the Primus, signed with their own hand, concerning those matters on account of which the synod was precisely called to meet, and this shall be holden for their

canonical vote. The absent bishops may likewise propose to the synod in writing anything they shall judge expedient for the good of the Church ; and, as to other matters that may incidentally come before the synod, the absent bishop or bishops must be concluded by the majority of those that are present. But no synod shall be holden, unless there be more bishops present than absent.

“XIV. That in all questions or cases where the bishops shall happen to be equally divided in their opinions, in synod or out of synod, that side of the question shall carry upon which the Primus gives his vote.

“XV. That if any presbyter or deacon, who shall have the misfortune to be deposed by his bishop, do presume to perform any part of the sacred office, or to gather a separate or schismatical congregation, he shall be excommunicated : and, if any clergyman shall take upon him to countenance such presbyter or deacon in their schismatical separation, he shall be suspended from the exercise of his holy function for such space as his bishop shall think fit. And such of the laity as shall adventure to adhere to the deposed presbyter or deacon, either in worship or other sacred administration, shall not be allowed to partake of any church ordinances, until they are reconciled again, and received by the bishop of the district.

“XVI. That if any clergyman shall take upon him to join persons together in matrimony, who belong to the congregation of another clergyman, without a certificate or recommendation from their former pastor, he shall for the first fault be suspended from his office for the space of three months, six months for the second fault, and for the third fault he shall be suspended sine die.”

The first ten canons were prepared by Bishop Rattray ; the eleventh was drawn up by Bishop Dunbar ; the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth, were the composition of Bishop Falconer ; and the fifteenth and sixteenth of Bishop White.

To these canons the bishops annexed a declaration, which, as they explain, was formerly made by them at a synod held in Edinburgh in 1733, “That they do not arrogate to themselves any temporal right whatsoever, or that any division or regulation of districts, which has been or may be made by them, ought to subsist, when it shall please Almighty God, in the

course of his providence, to restore this Church to a legal establishment; nor do they hereby in the least intend to encroach upon the just rights and privileges competent to secular powers in ecclesiastical affairs."

The bishops in synod also agreed to recommend to their clergy, in the strongest manner, to use the Scottish Liturgy in the administration of the Holy Communion; to administer Baptism, and to solemnize Matrimony, according to the forms in the Liturgy; to take all pains to persuade their people to have the banns publicly proclaimed before Marriage; and to admit no persons to the Communion, until confirmed by the bishop, or shewing their desire for Confirmation where it could not be had. Bishop Keith was requested to search for a copy of the Ordinal of 1620, and to adapt it for use, having special regard, in doing so, to the monuments of primitive antiquity. Nothing farther, however, seems to have been done in this matter.

Since the unfortunate attempt in the reign of Charles the First, no code of canons had been framed for the government of the Scottish Church, though the best of the prelates and clergy had always lamented the deficiency, and on various occasions had endeavoured to procure a remedy. The code now enacted, unlike that of Charles, was drawn up and promulgated by the proper rulers of the Church; but, in some respects, it also wanted that full authority which would have been desirable. At this time it was neither requisite nor possible to have the approbation of the civil government; but the laity might have been consulted, in some form, regarding matters in which they were so seriously interested, and, at all events, the consent of the second order of the clergy should have been obtained. It does not appear, however, that remonstrances were made by the laity in any part of the Church, or by the clergy of the dioceses over which bishops presided; but the enactment of this code by the sole authority of the

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 1-14. Minutes of the Synod of 1743 among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, No. G. 17, of the Catalogue. Bishop Alexander's deed of consecration, in the same collection, not numbered in the Catalogue. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 654-660. MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, pp. 24, 25. Sievwright's Principles, pp. 292, 300. The bishops were probably not aware of the defective character of the Ordinal of 1620, or of the very existence of that of 1636.

prelates, combined with some provisions in the canons themselves, caused great dissatisfaction among the clergy of the vacant see of Edinburgh, and led to discussions of which an account will be given.

CHAPTER LXXVIII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE SYNOD OF EDINBURGH IN AUGUST, 1743, TO THE ARRIVAL OF
PRINCE CHARLES IN SCOTLAND IN JULY, 1745.

Meeting of the clergy of Edinburgh—Their letter to the Bishops—Their objections to the Canons of 1743—Account of the Scottish Communion Office—Its gradual adoption by the clergy—Declaration by the Bishops in regard to the English Liturgy—Farther correspondence between the Bishops and the Edinburgh clergy—Arrival of Prince Charles in Scotland—State of the Church during the first part of the reign of George the Second.

ON the twenty-sixth of October, 1743, Bishop White was elected by the clergy of Fife as successor to the Primus, Bishop Keith, in the superintendence of that district; and, his translation having been agreed to by the Episcopal College, he soon afterwards resigned the see of Dunblane. A mandate was issued for the election of a bishop to the diocese of Dunblane, and, on the seventeenth of July, 1744, the clergy made choice of Thomas Ogilvie, a presbyter at Brechin; but his election was not confirmed by the Episcopal College, and the see remained vacant. It is said that the College refused to confirm, because the bishop elect was opposed to the usages.¹

The canons of the late synod conferred on the bishops the power of appointing the deans of their several dioceses; but, in the case of vacant districts, it was declared that the clergy were to have the right of choosing a dean from among their own number. In terms of an injunction of the synod, the Primus ordered Thomas Auchinleck, the senior presbyter of the diocese of Edinburgh, to convoke his fellow presbyters for the purpose of choosing a dean, and the clergy accordingly met

MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, p. 29. Keith's Catalogue, pp. 547, 548. Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, Nos. 30, 31, 32, 34, of the Catalogue

on the seventeenth of January, 1744. After electing Mr. Auchinleck to be chairman, the letter of the Primus was read; but, instead of proceeding to the choice of a dean, the meeting took under its consideration the canons lately enacted, and the authority by which they were imposed.

The resolutions agreed to were embodied in a letter, which commenced in the following manner:—"To the right reverend the Bishops of the Churches in Scotland, the Presbyters of the diocese of Edinburgh send greeting." The letter was signed by Mr. Auchinleck, as moderator, by the clerk of the meeting, and by fifteen other presbyters. After some preliminary observations, they went on to say, "We shall not at present trouble your reverences with remarks upon your canons any further than they concern ourselves, and even that would not have been our choice, but that the necessity you have put us under would make our silence sinful; for it is with grief of heart we find ourselves obliged to complain of the proceedings of those whom by principle and inclination we are much disposed to love and obey. But, while we honour your sacred office, and do not at all envy you the dignity to which you have attained, we cannot be quite unconcerned for the rights of our own lower order, when we see designs forming to invade those rights, or threaten them with danger. This concern, we humbly conceive, cannot be displeasing to your reverences, if it is considered only as an imitation of that zeal to preserve those rights which some of your venerable number shewed when ye were with us; nor can we think it less incumbent upon us to watch over this sacred depositum, that we have now, by what means we shall not say, been long kept in a state of orphanacy, without the guidance and protection of a proper head, when, like the clergy of Rome during the vacancy of that see, *incumbat nobis, qui videmur præpositi esse, vice pastoris custodire gregem*. As we humbly apprehend the constitution of a Christian church is a thing so sacred and so determined, that it cannot be new modelled or altered in essentials upon every revisal made of it by any one of its constituent parts; so it is no more competent to your high order to abolish the presbyterate, than it is in our power to renounce or withhold that canonical obedience we owe to our bishops. So it appears to us, from our histories, from our re-

cords, from our laws of the kingdom establishing Episcopacy, from the writings of some of our most judicious divines, and from the testimony of some of our brethren yet living, who saw the Church in vigour, and were eye-witnesses of her good order and government, that, by the constitution of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, the presbyters did sit in synods and church assemblies with their bishops, not barely to hear and propose, but to reason and represent; that they had authoritative voices, and voted decisively, in whatsoever question came before them; that not only the deans, and other dignitaries of each diocese, came to those assemblies in their own right, but the rural clergy were duly represented there by some of their own number, chosen by themselves, and sent thither on that purpose, whose votes were numbered with the rest; and, in short, that the powers of legislation and discipline were not then thought to have been lodged in the bishops alone, without the advice and concurrence of their clergy."

After referring to the example of the sister Church of England, where no canons could be enacted without the consent of the presbyters, and where each house of convocation had a negative on the other, they added: "The constitution of our Church thus appearing to us to be regular, and right, and well founded, we humbly conceive that we are obliged in conscience, in virtue of the duty we owe to God and his Church, to your reverences, to ourselves, and to all them who may succeed us in the second order, earnestly to beg you would stop all further innovation of any sort, and particularly all encroachments upon the rights and privileges of our second order, or whatever may tend to subverting that good and wholesome constitution; for we humbly conceive the case is the same in bodies mystical and politic as in the natural body, that when the constitution is once broken, if it is not soon repaired by immediate care and proper application, nothing but languishing and death is like to ensue. This being our constitution, and considering that you have proceeded single and alone to hold a synod, wherein you have made or ratified several canons, and treated and concluded in matters of legislation and discipline relating to the whole Church, notwithstanding the presbyters of Scotland were not represented there, nor were called to take that place which belongs to them in synods and assemblies of the

Church ; this being the hard case, we do earnestly beg your reverences will consider seriously what must be the fatal consequence, whether laws and constitutions can be submitted to where the legislature was incomplete, or, if they should be submitted to, whether the constitution of the Church would not thereby receive a deep wound."

They next entered on an examination of several of the canons. They objected to the ninth, which exempted from the jurisdiction of their proper local bishop the clergy and laity of any congregation, of which another bishop, residing out of his own diocese, was the particular pastor. They declared that this exemption, and the pretended necessity alleged for it, were opposed to the polity and rules of the ancient Church, and were especially prejudicial to the diocese of Edinburgh. They also objected to the third canon, by which all metropolitan and vicarial power was taken away from the Primus ; referring to the declaration formerly made by the bishops in regard to the necessity of a metropolitan for the preservation of unity and order, and stating that this canon was intended to injure the rights of the see of Edinburgh, of which they were the guardians during a vacancy. They also referred to the fourth, fifth, and seventh canons, which forbade the clergy of vacant dioceses to proceed to an election without a mandate, ordered a new election in the event of the bishops being dissatisfied with the person chosen by the presbyters, and enjoined the presbyters, during a vacancy, to apply to the nearest bishop only for the performance of episcopal offices ; stating that these rules deprived the presbyters of valuable privileges, and reduced their rights almost to a shadow, and that, to complete the new scheme of ecclesiastical polity, instead of sitting in their own right, or by their representatives in synod, they were henceforth to be represented by a cipher, a mere titular dean, who might hear and speak, but was not to be allowed the privilege of voting.¹

The commencement of this letter was disrespectful, and there were expressions in it partaking more of the angry feelings of disputants, than of the reverence due by presbyters to

¹ MS. Volume, entitled "Disputes of the Episcopalians," in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, as quoted by Lawson, p. 269-276. MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, pp. 25, 26.

bishops ; but there was much truth in what was stated, and it would have been well if the Episcopal College had given it their most serious consideration. It is evident, however, that they were more annoyed by the language of the letter, than convinced by its arguments. Their irritation was increased by the interference of Bishop George Smith, one of the English Nonjuring prelates, who received into communion a deposed Scottish clergyman, and encouraged the presbyters of Edinburgh in their opposition, leading them to expect that one of their number might be consecrated by himself and his brethren in the South, and accusing the Scottish bishops of a design to exclude the English Liturgy altogether from the services of the Church.

Bishop Smith's conduct in reference to the deprived clergyman was irregular, and his proposal to raise one of the discontented presbyters to the episcopate would, if carried out, have been an act of manifest schism ; but his charge in regard to the Liturgy seemed to be justified by the preamble to the late canons, and by the actions of the Scottish prelates. The subject is an important one, and deserves a careful examination.

By the first article of the concordate of 1731, it was declared that the bishops should only make use of the Scottish or the English Liturgy in the public divine service ; and that they should not disturb the peace of the Church by introducing into the public worship any of the ancient usages concerning which there had lately been a difference of opinion among them, and that they should censure any of their clergy who should act otherwise. The meaning of this is not very clear ; but, as the parties who drew it up could hardly have failed to be aware that such was the case, the ambiguity was probably intentional.

The difficulty lay in the meaning of the words, " Scottish Liturgy," and " ancient usages." Previously to the concordate, the English Book of Common Prayer was in general use in the daily service of the Church, and there is no evidence that the daily offices in the Book of King Charles the First were anywhere used. The words of the concordate, therefore, unless so far as they may have included the occasional offices, must practically, as well as in strict ecclesiastical language, have meant the Scottish and the English Communion Offices. The

English Office, of course, was that in the Book of Common Prayer, but the Scottish Office referred to was not necessarily that of King Charles the First's Book. Most of the clergymen who used the Scottish Liturgy did so with various alterations, which, for the sake of convenience, were sometimes marked in manuscript in the printed copies. The most common of these alterations were incorporated in an edition of the Communion Office, printed at Aberdeen in 1735. At the synod of 1743, Bishop Dunbar, in a written communication to the assembled prelates, suggested that the Scottish Office should be either enjoined or recommended; and, in a separate document, he proposed that a new edition of the text of 1735 should be printed. The synod, as formerly mentioned, strongly recommended the use of the Scottish Office, and, in the course of the year 1743, another edition of it was published. The forms and arrangement, adopted in the editions of 1735 and 1743, correspond substantially with the office of 1764, of which an account will afterwards be given. The most important change from King Charles's Office was the alteration of the rubric prefixed to the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, in which the words "militant here in earth" were omitted; undoubtedly in order that the faithful departed might not seem to be excluded. As already explained, two of the usages, the Invocation and the Oblation, formed essential parts of King Charles's Office. The Mixture was introduced in the new Scottish Office, not by express direction, as in the first Liturgy of King Edward the Sixth and in the form published by the English Nonjurors, but by actual use on the part of the priest; and it might have been left out in the celebration, so far as the words or the rubrics went.

In the year 1743, the Scottish Communion Office, as remodelled, had been established in most of the congregations beyond the Forth, and, to a certain extent also, in the diocese of Edinburgh. An account of the state of matters in this respect is given in a letter written by Robert Lyon, a presbyter at Perth, to his diocesan, Bishop Alexander, in November, 1743. "The majority," he says, "who use the Scotch Liturgy, is so great, that they are now but very few who do otherwise, and these few in the southern parts mostly, overawed by some ignorant laity. All in this district are unani-

mous in the Scotch, save myself, who, not of inclination, but for reasons too well known, was obliged to comply with borrowing only the Invocation and Oblation from the Scotch. All in Bishop Rait's district use the Scotch Communion Office likewise, except two; but whether these two transpose the oblatory prayer or not I cannot tell, but sure I am Bishop Ochterlonie himself did so. I am likewise sure that the greatest part of the presbyters in Fife, if not all, do use the Scotch, but this you yourself have easy access to know; and besides, the most of all these clergy use it in its natural order, according to the edition printed at Aberdeen. It is also well known, and without doubt to yourself, that there is not one single presbyter benorth the Mearns who does not officiate by the Scotch; so that those who use the English, or who transpose the oblatory prayer, though joined together, are few, very few upon the comparison. And I am persuaded the most of the clergy of my acquaintance, and with great sincerity I can say it of myself, would much sooner resign our several charges than give up the Scotch to use the English Communion Office; yea, the greatest number even of our laity would desert us should we attempt it." To a similar effect Bishop Keith, in a letter written to Bishop Smith, in December of the same year, in answer to a proposal by the latter to abolish the Scottish Communion Office, and substitute the English Liturgy in its place, mentions that there were not five presbyters in the whole Church, exclusive of the diocese of Edinburgh, who ministered by the English Liturgy, and not above three, even in Edinburgh, who ministered by it without addition or transposition.

When the concordate of 1731 allowed the use of the Scottish Liturgy, but prohibited the disturbance of the peace of the Church by the introduction of the ancient usages concerning which there had been a difference among the bishops, the Invocation and the Oblation could not have been included among the forbidden usages, because they were to be found, not only in the Scottish Office as actually used, but in the Liturgy of King Charles. It was otherwise, however, in regard to the Mixture, and to the change in the rubric which gave direct sanction to prayers for the faithful departed. These were forbidden by the concordate, unless by the Scottish

Liturgy was meant, not only the proper Liturgy of King Charles, but the office then in actual use, though without any recognized text. It was maintained by Bishops Freebairn and Ochterlonie, and by those who had all along opposed what they called innovations in public worship, that the prelates who used the new office were bound by the concordate to give up that office, and to adopt one or other of the established liturgies, and that the mixed cup, and the commemoration of the faithful departed, were in consequence unlawful. Bishop Rattray, and those who acted with him, denied this interpretation, and contended that the sanction given to the Scottish Liturgy implied the lawfulness of the usages then incorporated with it in the actual worship of the Church. This latter view is supported by Skinner. Referring to the concordate, he says, "In the first of these articles we find a permission of the Scottish Liturgy and a prohibition of the ancient usages, a distinction which at first sight may appear a little inconsistent. But it is to be remembered that, besides the points in difference between the Scotch Communion Office and the present English Book, which are the points now called the usages, there were some other rites of ancient observance, such as Immersion in Baptism, Chrism in Confirmation and for anointing the sick, and a few more of that kind, which Bishop Collier, and his friends in England, wished to have restored; and these are the usages meant in this article, and in every article of agreement where we find the Scottish Liturgy allowed, and certain antiquated usages prohibited."¹

¹ Skinner, vol. ii. pp. 647, 648. Mr. Cheyne's *Vindication of the Scottish Communion Office*, p. 23-30. Minutes of the Synod of 1743, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, No. G. 17; letter, Bishop Dunbar to Henry Edgar, in the same collection, No. G. 15; and letter, Bishop Keith to Bishop Smith, in the same collection, No. L. 29, of the Catalogue. According to Siewright, who quotes part of a letter from Bishop Freebairn to Bishop Ochterlonie, the advocates of the usages used a very disingenuous argument. When "pressed," he says, "to lay aside the usages entirely, and confine themselves in their public worship to the express words of the genuine and authorized liturgies, in terms of the agreement, they excused themselves by this remarkable knock, 'That they shall not introduce any of the ancient usages into the public worship of God, for that they are already introduced.'" (*Principles*, p. 285.) It appears from Dundas's *Supplement* (p. xxxvii.), that during the disputes between the two parties, previously to the year 1731, Rattray and his friends had attempted to introduce the Communion Office of the English Non-jurors.

The alterations in the Communion Office of King Charles's Book were so firmly established in the year 1743, that the prelates, even if disposed, could not have prohibited them. But in their synod they seemed to go beyond a mere sanction of what was now undoubtedly the Scottish Liturgy. They declared in the preamble to the canons that, the bishops being now perfectly united and of one mind, the concordates, which were formed when some unhappy differences existed among them, were in consequence vacated. The canons themselves said nothing as to any liturgy; but the preamble, taken along with the recommendation of the Scottish use by the synod, was thought to imply an intention to suppress the English Office altogether, and to establish that which it was well known they individually preferred. This charge called forth an indignant denial from the Primus, Bishop Keith, in a letter written to Bishop Smith on the twenty-second of May, 1744, in which he also referred to the interference of the English prelate with the affairs of the Scottish Church, and to his encouragement of the Edinburgh presbyters.

To meet the accusation more effectually, a formal contradiction was drawn up on the twelfth of July, and was subscribed by the Primus, and Bishops Dunbar, White, Falconer, and Alexander. That document was as follows:—

“I. Whereas, by the preface to Bishop Rattray's ten canons, passed and ratified in our synod holden at Edinburgh in the month of August, 1743, it is represented, that the Bishops of the Church of Scotland, being now by the good providence of God perfectly united in one and the same mind, and that the concordates, which were framed while some unhappy differences subsisted among them, are thereby vacated; we hereby declare that this expression, (which, together with the whole preface was the work of Bishop Rattray,) as well as the canons themselves, regards only the concordates being vacated through the total demise of one party of those bishops who contracted and concurred in framing the concordates, but that it never was intended (as some persons have suspected) to prohibit or restrict the use of the English Liturgy in this kingdom. So far from this, that we declare the use of this Liturgy has been and shall be as free to any presbyter that chooses to minister by it, as it was and has been at any time by virtue of the concordates.

“II. We declare that we are in full communion with the Church of England, as a sister Church, and are ready to give outward evidence thereof on all occasions, like as we expect the same compliance from the members of that Church, when occasion shall offer. May the Church of England long preserve the just esteem and veneration it has gained in the Christian world; may this esteem be always on the increase, and may the gates of hell never be able to prevail either against it or this Church; and may both Churches ever continue to cultivate union and harmony together, to the credit of our holy religion, and the promoting of true piety and virtue.

“III. For ourselves, as we know that in the present situation of this Church we have no external coercive power, so we esteem the concurrence of our presbyters and people the only support, under God, of our episcopal government; and, whenever we are made duly sensible of any just grievances, both duty and interest will oblige us speedily to remove them. It is the love and prayers of our clergy and people that must strengthen our hands. Each of us in particular is blessed with most dutiful and obliging presbyters, and we declare that we will do nothing of moment without consulting them, and this union, we trust, will stand firm against all opposition. We must stand or fall together.”¹

As the bishops returned no answer to the Edinburgh address, the clergy of that diocese assembled again on the twenty-seventh of July. They drew up and sent to the Primus a second paper, in which they referred to the solicitations they had made in vain some years before for a mandate to elect a bishop, and to their late address on the subject of the canons, which had been disregarded in the same way. They also requested that some proper assurances should be given that the English Liturgy would neither actually nor virtually be proscribed, and that its full use would be continued to all who wished to avail themselves of it.

As the bishops still gave no direct answer, the Edinburgh clergy met a third time on the twenty-second of December,

¹ MS. Voiume, quoted by Lawson, p. 276-279. By the “Church of England,” there can be little doubt that the Scottish bishops meant the Nonjuring communion in that country.

and transmitted to the prelates the following proposals for adjusting the differences between them :—

“ I. That you will null and void the canons of last synod, as having no proper authority, and redress the grievances consequent upon them ; and that no new canons be made binding upon the clergy and laity of this Church without competent authority.

“ II. That, since the first article of the last concordate has been frequently violated and broke through, viz., that we shall only make use of the Scottish or English Liturgy in the public or divine service, nor shall we disturb the peace of the Church by introducing into the public worship any of the ancient usages concerning which there has been lately a difference among us, and that we shall censure any of the clergy who act otherwise, the present bishops do each of them subscribe to this as a condition of peace and union, and any, who shall be hereafter promoted, immediately before his consecration ; and that they give proper assurance for the due execution of it, without any mutilation, alteration, or transposition, in either of the offices, in the administration of Baptism, Confirmation, and of the Lord’s Supper, and in the Ordination of Deacons and Presbyters, and Consecration of Bishops.

“ III. That the privilege of electing bishops be ascertained to the presbyters of this Church in their respective districts, and that the bishops be obliged to consecrate the elect, upon presenting the instruments of election subscribed by a majority of the presbyters of the district, except the local custom impede it, or they make relevant objections against the faith and morals of the elect, and prove them in a regular canonical manner.

“ IV. That the division of districts made by the concordate be observed, or reduced by common consent to six or seven, which will serve all the needful occasions of episcopal administrations in this Church ; and that no election be made without calling all the presbyters of that district to it.

“ V. That in conferring holy orders, and exercising acts of discipline within each district, every thing of moment be managed by common consent of the bishop and his presbyters ; and, in case a majority of the presbyters be against the opinion of their bishop, he shall have a negative upon them ; for, as

Bishop Sage says, by our constitution they can do nothing without him, nor he without them."

The proposals concluded with an earnest and humble request that the bishops would take steps for restoring peace to the Church. This altered language on the part of the presbyters at last called forth a reply from the Primus. In a letter to the Edinburgh clergy, dated the twenty-fifth of January, 1745, he thanked them for their expressions of sympathy; mentioned that no decisive answer could be given except by the bishops in synod; and entreated them to avoid those practices, so prevalent at this time, which tended to produce schism and confusion in the Church.¹

Six months after the date of the letter last referred to, Prince Charles, the grandson of James the Seventh, landed in Scotland, and the events which followed caused all ecclesiastical controversies to be forgotten.

Bishop Campbell died on the sixteenth of June, 1744. For some years he had taken no part in the affairs of the Scottish Church.²

The first part of the reign of George the Second was afterwards looked back upon as a period of happiness and tranquillity in the Church, compared with the dreary years which succeeded; and, though its prosperity was no doubt heightened by the contrast, it was really a time during which, with external quietness, there was an increase of religious zeal and piety, and a development of higher ecclesiastical principles. Beyond the Forth the clergy and laity were united in willing obedience to their bishops, and in attachment to the worship and doctrines of their Church. In the South, equal unanimity

¹ MS. Volume quoted by Lawson, p. 280-285. MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, p. 26-29.

² Skinner, vol. ii. p. 694. A list of Bishop Campbell's works is given by Mr. Lawson, in his History, p. 236. By an indenture, dated the fifth of July, 1737, entered into between Bishop Campbell, therein styled "The Honourable Archibald Campbell of Westminster, in the county of Middlesex, Esquire," on the one part, and the President and Fellows of Sion College, London, on the other part, the bishop gave to the Library of the College an authentic manuscript copy of the original records of "the Church or Kirk of Scotland," from the beginning of the Reformation to the year 1616, on condition that, if Episcopacy should be restored in Scotland, and a majority of the Scottish bishops should desire a transcript of the records, they should be allowed to make one. There is an original counterpart of the deed, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland,

would probably have existed, if the prelates had acted solely as spiritual rulers, and disregarded all mere political considerations. Unfortunately, they still clung to old prejudices, even when their maintenance interfered with the discharge of higher duties.

The description given by later writers of the tranquil period referred to is in one point inaccurate. The clergy were not so numerous as has generally been represented. They had greatly decreased in number since they were entirely deprived of the parochial cures. In the year 1745, and for some time previously, there were not more than one hundred and fifty presbyters in communion with the Scottish bishops. In regard to the numbers and influence of the laity it is not easy to speak with certainty. Perhaps half of the nobility, and a considerable though a smaller proportion of the gentry, retained their ancestral principles. In many districts of the North, and of the Highlands, a majority even of the middle and lower classes still adhered to Episcopacy.¹

No. R. 21, of the Catalogue. These records, forming a portion of those which were laid before the Glasgow assembly of 1638, and authenticated by the signature of Johnston of Warriston, remained in the Library of Sion College, the governors of which refused to deliver them up to the general assembly of the established Church of Scotland; but, having been exhibited on an order of a committee of the House of Commons, they were burned in the fire which destroyed the houses of Parliament in 1834. See Peterkin's Preface to the Book of the Universal Kirk.

¹ In reference to the numbers of the clergy, it is mentioned in the Memoirs of the Affairs of the Episcopal Church, appended to Lawson's History, p. 534, that, in the year 1734, on a list being made of all the presbyters in the kingdom, "it was found that there were only about a hundred and thirty—a smaller number than was at first supposed." With this agrees a statement by Sievwright, in the preface to his Principles, p. vi., made on the authority of a letter of Bishop Freebairn, that, in 1734, there were a hundred and twenty-six Nonjuring ministers in Scotland, exclusive of the prelates. Bishop Keith, in his letter already referred to, written to Bishop Smith in December, 1743 (Papers of the Scottish Episcopal Church in Scotland, No. L. 29, of the Catalogue), states that at that time there were about one hundred and twenty-five presbyters in Scotland.

CHAPTER LXXIX.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE ARRIVAL OF PRINCE CHARLES IN SCOTLAND IN JULY, 1745, TO
THE DEATH OF KING GEORGE II. IN OCTOBER, 1760.

The insurrection of 1745—Severe measures against the Episcopal Church—Penal act of 1746—Penal act of 1748—Debate in the House of Lords—The worship of the Church proscribed—Effect of the penal laws on the ritual of the Church—Diminished numbers of the Laity—Their religious character—Account of Alexander, Lord Pitsligo—Death of Bishop Keith—Bishop White appointed Primus—Death of King George the Second.

THE last attempt of the Stewarts to recover possession of the British throne is intimately connected with the history of Episcopacy in Scotland, as it led to the enactment of the statutes by which the supporters of that form of ecclesiastical government were proscribed for many years. Various circumstances favoured the success of Prince Charles at this time. The Highlanders were now the only portion of the Scottish nation accustomed to warfare; and, though the chiefs who acknowledged the house of Hanover were at least as powerful as those who took arms for the prince, the clans followed their Jacobite leaders with ardent zeal, but were indifferent in the cause of such as adhered to the established government. In the Lowlands, the great body of the people were animated by no strong feeling of attachment to the reigning dynasty; while many of the gentry were devoted to the exiled house. The union with England was still unpopular among all classes; and those with whom national independence was the most cherished sentiment, were favourable to an enterprise which promised to sever their close connection with the southern kingdom. The personal feeling of loyalty was manifested exclusively on the side of the Stewarts, and it was excited to a degree of chivalrous enthusiasm by the presence of

the young prince who had so boldly committed himself and his cause to the fidelity of his Scottish subjects, while there was nothing in the character of George the Second to excite the devotion, or to animate the zeal, of his adherents.¹

For some time the hopes of the Jacobites were raised to the highest pitch. Within a few weeks after his standard was set up, the prince obtained possession of Edinburgh, and defeated the Hanoverian army at Prestonpans. Had his English friends been as zealous as the northern chiefs and gentry, the immediate result of the enterprise might have been different. But, when the retreat from Derby was resolved on, the cause of the insurgents became hopeless ; and, in April, 1746, they were utterly routed at Culloden by the royal army under the Duke of Cumberland. The humiliations and indignities which the Scottish nation endured after this defeat were greater than any they had suffered since the time of Cromwell. The Hanoverian ministers acted as if the whole people had favoured the insurrection, and disregarded the remonstrances of those who had been most faithful to the cause of King George. This severity was the less excusable that the insurgent army had uniformly behaved with humanity and moderation.

During the march of the Duke of Cumberland's army to the north, and after the suppression of the insurrection, the places of worship used by the Episcopal communion were shut up, and, in many instances, were burned to the ground, or otherwise destroyed. But the statesmen at the head of the government were not satisfied with these proceedings. They were determined, by increasing the severity of the laws, and by a more rigorous enforcement of them, to suppress the ministrations of the clergy, which, it was alleged, had been mainly instrumental in producing the rebellion. No sufficient cause, however, had been given for such measures. The clergy were Nonjurors ; and undoubtedly their affections and sympathies were with him whom they acknowledged as their rightful sovereign. But in none of the dioceses had they publicly come for-

¹ An attentive contemporary observer, who himself was strongly attached to the reigning house, asserts that "the commons in general, as well as two thirds of the gentry at that period, had no aversion to the family of Stewart ; and could their religion have been secured, would have been very glad to see them on the throne again." (*Autobiography of Dr. Carlyle*, p. 133.)

ward to own his cause, as they did in 1715. And though the laity shared the opinions of their pastors, and some of the most distinguished of them were in arms against the government, many Presbyterians were also to be found among the insurgents. These circumstances gave the new statutes the appearance of enactments for the suppression, not of disloyal practices, but of religious belief; and the nature of the provisions themselves shewed clearly enough that such was the actual intention of their framers.¹

The statute of 1719, formerly referred to, had prohibited all persons from officiating in Episcopal meeting-houses, where nine or more were assembled in addition to the members of the household, unless the persons so officiating prayed in express terms for King George and the royal family, and had taken the oath of abjuration. In the summer of 1746, being the nineteenth year of the reign of King George the Second, a statute was passed, entitled "An act more effectually to prohibit and prevent pastors or ministers from officiating in Episcopal meeting-houses in Scotland, without duly qualifying themselves according to law; and to punish persons for resorting to any meeting-houses where such unqualified pastors or ministers shall officiate." This statute contained provisions which seem to have been borrowed from the English and Scottish conventicle acts of the reign of King Charles the Second. It declared that all pastors of Episcopal congregations in Scotland should, before the first day of September then next, take the oaths appointed by law, and should after that date pray in express terms for the king and the royal family by name. All meeting-houses, the pastors of which should not comply with this enactment, were to be shut up; and all pastors, who should exercise their functions after the date mentioned without having registered their letters of orders, and without having taken the oaths, or without praying for the king and the royal family, were, for the first offence, to be imprisoned for six months, and for the second or any subsequent offence to be

¹ According to Mr. Barton (vol. ii. p. 358), "in the rebellion of 1745, the Scottish Episcopal Church came forth again so flagrantly in support of the deposed house of Stewart, that severe restraints could no longer be avoided;" but he adduces no authority for this statement, and does not give a single illustration of it.

transported to the plantations in America for life, and, if they returned to Great Britain after such sentence, were to be imprisoned for life. In order to ascertain what was to be deemed a meeting-house, it was further declared that any meeting, assembly, or congregation in Scotland, where five persons or more, in addition to the household, if in a house, or five or more persons in a place where no family was residing, assembled for the purpose of divine worship performed by a minister of the Episcopal communion, should be deemed an Episcopal meeting-house, within the meaning of the statute. Enactments also were made, for the first time, in regard to the laity attending the ministrations of the Episcopal clergy. It was declared that all persons attending the meetings prohibited by the act should, for the first offence, be fined five pounds, and for the second or any subsequent offence be imprisoned for two years; and penalties and disabilities were imposed on peers, and on persons elected members of parliament, magistrates of burghs, or other public officers, or having a right to vote at the election of such persons.

Severe as these provisions were, the enactment contained in the ninth section of the statute was, on ecclesiastical principles, yet more objectionable. It was as follows:—"Be it enacted by the authority foresaid that, from and after the said first day of September, no letters of orders of any pastor or minister of any Episcopal meeting or congregation in Scotland shall be deemed sufficient, or be admitted to be registered, but such as have been given by some bishop of the Church of England or of Ireland; and in case any letters of orders, other than such as are before described, shall be registered, such registration shall be deemed null and void to all intents and purposes." This clause, taken along with other portions of the act, seemed to imply that all clergymen, whose letters of orders were registered before the first of September, and who afterwards obeyed the other provisions of the statute, might claim a legal toleration; but that after the first of September no clergyman of Scottish ordination, even if willing to obey the laws in all respects, would be allowed to officiate to more than four persons at a time. The clause, however, admitted of a more strict interpretation, and might imply that after the day mentioned no letters of orders would be sufficient except

those granted by an English or an Irish bishop, and that all Scottish letters of orders, though registered previously, should become null and void. In either sense, the obvious intention of the legislature was to suppress the Scottish Episcopal Church and the native clergy altogether, and to grant toleration to those clergymen only who derived their orders from the English and Irish Churches.

So far as appears, no more than five Scottish clergymen attempted to avail themselves of the provisions of the statute, by qualifying in terms of law. Two of them, John Skinner, the ecclesiastical historian, incumbent of Longside in the diocese of Aberdeen, and Mr. Livingstone, incumbent of Deer in the same diocese, afterwards expressed their penitence for what they had done, and received absolution from their bishop. The five who complied with the statute continued to officiate in their meeting-houses; but the public ministrations of all the rest of the clergy in communion with the Scottish bishops ceased on the first of September. In order to keep up divine worship, the clergy were obliged to meet with various portions of their congregations at several places in the course of the Sunday. They generally took care that the number who assembled together did not exceed four, in addition to the family; and, in some instances where they neglected this precaution, the offenders were imprisoned in terms of the act.¹

No religious body which believed that active obedience to the law was forbidden by a higher principle could have acted more inoffensively, or shewn a greater desire to submit, so far as they conscientiously could, than the Scottish clergy did for two years after the passing of this statute. But the government was not satisfied. It was determined to increase the rigour of the law, and to make the compliance of the few qualified clergy of no avail. For this, among other purposes, a bill was introduced into parliament, in May, 1748, which, referring to the doubt whether the act of 1746 extended to letters of orders registered before the first day of September in that year, declared "that no letters of orders, not granted by some bishop of the Church of England or of Ireland,

¹ MS. *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, p. 30-32. *Scots Magazine*, vol. viii. p. 446; vol. ix. p. 608; vol. x. p. 150.

should, from and after the twenty-ninth day of September, 1748, be sufficient, or be taken or adjudged to be sufficient, to qualify any such pastor or minister as above mentioned, whether the same were registered before or after the said first day of September; and that every such registration, either made before or after the said first day of September, should, from and after the said twenty-ninth day of September, be deemed null and void to all intents and purposes."

The bill passed through the Commons without much opposition; but it was resisted by a numerous body in the House of Lords, including all the bishops who were present. Among the prelates who spoke against it were Dr. Secker, Bishop of Oxford, afterwards primate, Dr. Sherlock, then Bishop of Salisbury, and Dr. Maddox, Bishop of Worcester. The Bishop of Oxford concluded his speech in the following words:—"The clause now under our consideration really seems to be an encroachment upon the Christian religion, as professed by the Church of England. It seems, in my opinion, to arrogate to the civil authority a power to determine whether a priest has been duly and regularly ordained, or a bishop consecrated, which is a question no true member of the Church of England will allow the civil authority to have any thing to do with. It is the Church only that can determine this question; and, if the Church determines that a priest has been duly and regularly ordained, he ought not by any civil authority to be debarred the exercise of his function, provided he conforms in every other respect to the laws of his country. This, my lords, is an argument that will, I am confident, have great weight with all those upon the same bench with me; but it is an argument we have not in this case any occasion for, because the injustice and cruelty of this clause with respect to the poor men who have conformed, in pursuance of the invitation given them but two years ago by act of parliament, is so manifest and glaring, that compassion must prevail, if justice should fail, to persuade us to reject the clause; and where both compassion and justice solicit, the good of our country and the security of our sovereign require of us a compliance; for which reason, I shall take the liberty to move that this clause be left out of the bill." Dr. Sherlock, while he stated his belief that the Nonjuring clergy had contributed to encourage

the late rebellion, added, " These clergymen, my lords, by the purity of their religious doctrines, by their learning, by the decency of their behaviour, and, chiefly by their sufferings, recommended themselves to the affection and esteem of all ranks of people ; and by their example, as well as by their private lectures, they recommended with great power those political principles they professed, and for which they suffered. These are the men whom we ought to gain over by mild usage, if possible ; and the more of them we gain over, the more strength we shall add to our present happy establishment, the more we shall weaken the cause of the Pretender." After referring to certain difficulties which Scottish clergymen would have in obtaining orders in England, he remarked, " But, my lords, supposing a poor man, enabled by charity to make such journies, when he is come as far as Carlisle, or Durham, how shall he expect to get himself ordained ? Our bishops are, by the canons, laid under many restrictions with respect to the granting of orders, one of which is, that no bishop shall ordain any person, who is not of his own diocese, without letters dimissory from the bishop of whose diocese he is ; and such letters it is impossible for any man in Scotland to obtain. Another restriction is, that the bishop is not to ordain any man without a title, that is, some place where he is to preach, and by which he may support himself, of which he must exhibit to the bishop a certificate ; and, if a bishop ordains any man without such a certificate, he is obliged to maintain him till he get him preferred to some ecclesiastical living. There are several other restrictions, my lords, by our canons ; and by a much higher authority, by the authority of the Apostle Paul, bishops are enjoined not to lay their hands rashly upon any man. How then can any man from the north of Scotland expect to be ordained by an English or Irish bishop, when he cannot obtain letters dimissory, or a certificate of his having a title, or a testimonial of his good life and conversation, from any person known to, or that can be credited by, the bishop ? And if he can surmount all these difficulties, unless he can obtain a dispensation from the bishop, he must go home again after obtaining deacon's orders, and after a year must make another such journey for obtaining the orders of priesthood. In short, my lords, there are so many diffi-

culties, that I must suppose this clause to have been suggested by some Presbyterian, or some enemy to the Church of England; and therefore I hope that next session something will be thought of for supplying the Episcopal Church in Scotland with qualified bishops, as well as ministers. In the meantime, I shall be against anything that shall deprive the Church there of any of the qualified Episcopal ministers they now have, and shall therefore be against the clause now under our consideration."

On the other side, the clause was strongly supported by Lord Chancellor Hardwick, and by the Dukes of Argyll and Newcastle. The arguments of the chancellor might have been fitly used in defence of the royal supremacy by Lauderdale or Rothes in the reign of Charles the Second; but the Duke of Newcastle went still farther, and contended that there was no canon against the Scottish clergy being ordained a second time by an English or an Irish bishop. In reference to this opinion of the lawfulness of reordination, the Bishop of Worcester observed, "Like parricide among the old Romans, the thing is so new that I believe there is no express canon against it;" and, in connection with another statement of the same nobleman, he added, "As to those poor clergymen who may by this clause be deprived of their only means of subsistence, notwithstanding their having taken the oaths to the government, I was really sorry to hear it suggested by the noble lord, that they might choose some other employment for the support of themselves and families. Alas! my lords, a clergyman in holy orders is expressly forbidden by the canons to give himself to any base or servile labour; and what other sort of employment can a poor man choose, who has no stock, unless it be a stock of learning, and a few books in his study? Therefore, to deprive a man of the liberty of officiating in any meeting-house in Scotland, is really to deprive him of his daily bread."

Notwithstanding the influence of the ministry, the clause was rejected on a division, by a majority of thirty-two to twenty-eight, twenty of the majority being bishops; but, on the report being brought up the following day, it was restored by a majority of thirty-seven to thirty-two.¹

¹ Parliamentary History, vol. xiv. p. 269-315. Scots Magazine, vol. x. p.

Another clause of the same act, which met with no opposition, increased the hardships of the clergy. A statute passed in the year 1746 had prohibited all persons from exercising the functions of a chaplain in any family in Scotland, without taking the oaths prescribed by law, under the penalty of six months imprisonment for the first offence, and banishment from Great Britain for seven years for the second or any subsequent offence. For the better ascertaining what should be deemed the function of a chaplain, within the meaning of that statute, it was now declared "that, from and after the twenty-ninth day of September, 1748, any person, being or pretending to be in holy orders, of any denomination whatsoever, other than the ministers, elders, or preachers of the established Church of Scotland, who should preach or perform any divine service in any house or family of which he was not the master, in the presence or hearing of any other person or persons, whether such persons were of the family or not, should be deemed to be one who exercised the employment, service, and function of a chaplain, within the provision and true intent and meaning of the same act."

The act last mentioned practically hindered the clergy from celebrating divine service anywhere, except in their own houses; and accordingly, from Michaelmas 1748, the time mentioned in the statute, they endeavoured, as they best could, to discharge their duty without incurring the penalties to which they were exposed. For this purpose they assembled their people in small numbers, within their own houses, at different hours, and on every day of the week. When the rigorous enforcement of the law began to be somewhat abated, the clergy ventured to avail themselves of various expedients. They celebrated divine service in apartments where the statutory number only was present, but where the house was so arranged that others could hear and see. The service was conducted in the quietest manner possible. Prayers were said, and a sermon was sometimes preached; but, to avoid attracting

589-596; vol. xi. p. 21-37. In the Parliamentary History, the speech of Bishop Maddox is erroneously attributed to the Earl of Morton. The fictitious name of "A. Terentius Varro," under which the speech of the Bishop of Worcester is reported in the Scots Magazine, is explained (vol. xi. p. 641); and, from internal evidence, it is clear that the speaker was not a Scottish nobleman.

notice, singing was not used. Sometimes the people met in larger numbers in solitary places, among the woods and mountains; but this was not a common practice, and seems to have been resorted to only where other expedients failed. In no single instance was opposition made when the worshippers were dispersed by the soldiers, or by the officers of the law. Both pastors and people faithfully observed their doctrine of non-resistance to the very letter. They believed that they were permitted to fight when their prince called on them to maintain his rights; but that in their own cause, and in that of the Church, such warfare was forbidden.

Although the clergy endeavoured, as far as in their power, to keep within the law, many cases must have occurred, in which they found it difficult or impossible to do so without abandoning a higher duty. In a few instances, the transgression was discovered, and the penalties of the law were exacted. Two of these may be mentioned. John Skinner, incumbent of Longside, had, as already stated, registered his letters of orders, and prayed for King George by name; but this compliance was of no avail under the provisions of the act of 1748. In May, 1753, he was apprehended on a charge of officiating to more than the statutory number of persons; and, having confessed the offence, he was imprisoned for six months. John Connochar, a clergyman in the western Highlands, of irreproachable character, and of considerable attainments, was apprehended on the thirtieth of January, 1755—the anniversary of a day on which, as the writer of an account of the trial mentions, “it was to be expected that he and his hearers would be engaged in their forbidden worship.” He was charged with a breach of the late statutes in the performance of divine service on various occasions. As he had not been previously convicted, six months imprisonment would have been the limit of his punishment; but he was also accused of celebrating clandestine marriages contrary to the provisions of an act of King Charles the Second, the penalty for which offence extended to banishment for life. It was proved that at the marriages which he celebrated every circumstance required by law was attended to, the only offence being that the ceremony was performed by a person who was not a minister of the established Church.

One of the Lords of Justiciary, before whom he was tried at Inverary, said that Nonjuring Episcopal clergymen of the prisoner's activity were dangerous to the present happy establishment. The jury found him guilty, but recommended him to mercy. He was sentenced to perpetual banishment from Scotland, and forbidden to return under pain of death.¹

The penal laws of the reign of George the Second effectually answered the purpose for which they were intended. The clergy, in almost every instance, did their duty earnestly and courageously. But, as time went on, their numbers decreased, and there were no adequate means of keeping up a sufficient supply of pastors for the scattered flocks, which now required more than ordinary care and watchfulness. The few who devoted themselves to the priesthood became timid and desponding. They carefully taught the doctrines of the Church to those committed to their charge, but shewed little zeal to make them known to others.

The progress of ecclesiastical improvement was unavoidably stopped in one important point. Ritual reform had hitherto accompanied the restoration of primitive doctrine; and a belief in the divine appointment of the apostolic ministry, and in the grace of the sacraments, had been enshrined in forms and liturgies, and in a ceremonial probably as perfect as circumstances would then allow. The persecution which destroyed the meeting-houses almost extinguished the solemnities of religious worship; and both clergy and people became so accustomed to irregularities, that, on the return of tranquillity, they hardly made an effort to remove them.

The personal and political disabilities created by the penal laws greatly diminished the numbers of the laity. Many of them fell away, the middle classes generally conforming to the establishment, and the gentry too often abstaining from attendance on religious worship of any kind. Those who were attached to liturgical services, but were afraid to incur the penalties imposed on the native clergy and their congregations, had recourse to ministers of English ordination. Hitherto the chapels of qualified clergymen who acted inde-

¹ MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, p. 32. Life of John Skinner, prefixed to his Theological Works, pp. xi. xii. Arnot's Criminal Trials, p. 339-343. Scots Magazine, vol. xvii. pp. 207, 209, 313-316.

pendently of episcopal authority had been found only in a few of the large towns; but now a considerable number of young men resorted to England, and, notwithstanding the difficulties which stood in the way, obtained orders from several of the bishops, and on their return to their own country collected congregations in various places.

The events which have been related, whether during the time of the Church's comparative prosperity, or of the persecution which followed, bear reference more to her outward condition and circumstances, than to the lives of her individual members. The virtues of some of the more eminent of the clergy have been mentioned, but few details have been preserved regarding the laity. The records, however, which remain, though they seldom enter into particulars, shew that among the laity were many zealous and good men, whose lives and conversation were such as became their Christian profession. Their piety was of a type differing in various respects from what was elsewhere to be found in Scotland. They had their full share of the ardent enthusiasm of their countrymen, but it was shewn chiefly in the maintenance of their political principles; in their religious character, they were calm, grave, and temperate, avoiding all appearance of display, and shrinking from every thing which bore even the semblance of fanaticism. An example of the Scottish layman of that time may be given in a nobleman, concerning whom more than the usual amount of information has been preserved.

Alexander, the fourth Lord Forbes of Pitsligo, was born in the year 1678, and succeeded to his father's title and the family estates in Aberdeenshire while under age. In early youth he resided for some time in France, and acquired the friendship of Fenelon. Though favourable to the cause of the exiled family, he took the oath of allegiance, and assumed his place in the parliament of Scotland in the end of the reign of King William. He continued to sit in the opening years of Queen Anne; but, when the English oath of abjuration was imposed at the union, he declined to take it, and retired from political life. He was one of the first who joined the Earl of Mar in 1715. He was present at the battle of Sheriff-muir, and afterwards escaped to the Continent. In the year 1720,

he was permitted to return to his own country. He resided at Pitsligo Castle, devoting the greatest part of his time to familiar intercourse with his friends, to the cultivation of literature, and to the study of works of mystical devotion, to which he had become attached during his first visit to France.

This peaceful and happy mode of life was brought to an end on the landing of Prince Charles in 1745. Though now advanced in years, and of infirm health, he thought that duty required him once more to maintain the cause of his sovereign. When his resolution became known, most of the gentry of the district put themselves under his command, and by his appointment met him at Aberdeen. He believed that in following this course he was simply obeying the will of God. When the little party of horsemen assembled, he rode to the front, took off his hat, and, looking up to heaven, said, "Lord, Thou knowest that our cause is just!—March, gentlemen." One who was present when he joined the prince's army a short time after the battle of Preston, remarked that "it seemed as if religion, virtue, and justice, were entering the camp, under the appearance of this venerable old man." He was treated by Charles with peculiar regard and affection, and shared all the fatigues and dangers of the expedition, till its disastrous conclusion.

Escaping from Culloden, Lord Pitsligo experienced the kindness and fidelity which the peasantry of the North almost uniformly shewed to the fugitives. He succeeded in returning to his own district, and, though the government discovered that he was in the neighbourhood, and endeavoured to apprehend him, he was protected by his tenantry and friends. After some years the search became less strict, and he was allowed to pass the remainder of his life in the house of Auchiries, with the family of which he was connected by marriage. Amidst all his dangers and misfortunes, his cheerfulness was unabated, and his religious duties were never forgotten. Before the insurrection, he attended the meeting-house at Fraserburgh; and, during his residence at Auchiries, the prayers of the Church were regularly said by one of the household, the Eucharist being celebrated, as occasion allowed, by the neighbouring clergyman.

Lord Pitsligo died on the twenty-first of December, 1762,

in the eighty-fifth year of his age. He was the author of a work, entitled "Essays Moral and Philosophical;" and his latter years were occupied in the composition of a treatise, which was published after his death under the name of "Thoughts concerning Man's condition and duties in this life, and his hopes in the world to come." Dr. William King thus spoke of him while still surviving:—"Whoever is so happy, either from his natural disposition or his good judgment, constantly to observe St. Paul's precept 'to speak evil of no one,' will certainly acquire the love and esteem of the whole community of which he is a member. But such a man is the *rara avis* in terris; and, among all my acquaintance, I have known only one person to whom I can with truth assign this character. The person I mean is the present Lord Pitsligo of Scotland." And Bishop Jolly, who, though not personally acquainted with Lord Pitsligo, had full and accurate information from those who were, wrote of him in the following terms:—"To him God was ALL, and the whole creation in itself, and of itself considered, was nothing. What a comfort it is to think that such heaven-lighted lamps shall never be extinguished; they are only moved from the antechamber into the inner court of the King Immortal, where they shine more and more; waiting for the arrival of those whom they left behind, that all in one glorious constellation may attain perfect splendour."¹

Under the most calamitous circumstances, the Scottish bishops and clergy did not neglect the duty of providing for the continuance of the episcopal succession, and the regular government of the Church. Bishop Dunbar, who had attained the eighty-fifth year of his age, resigned the see of Aberdeen on the fourth of July, 1745, and died in the beginning of the following year. It is probable that there was difficulty, if not danger, in the proceedings connected with the election and consecration of a successor; but, after some delay, Andrew Gerard, a presbyter at Aberdeen, was unanimously elected by the clergy, and was consecrated at Cupar in Fife on the seventeenth of July, 1747, by Bishops White, Falconer, Rait, and

¹ See Lord Medwyn's *Life of Lord Pitsligo*, prefixed to his edition of the *Thoughts concerning Man's condition and duties*.

Alexander, with consent of the Primus, who was prevented by infirmity from attending.¹

On the twentieth of January, 1757, Bishop Keith died at his residence near Leith, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. During a trying and calamitous period, he presided over the Church with great prudence and ability. He was not popular among the clergy of Edinburgh; but it is now impossible to say whether he was more blameable than his colleagues for the refusal to fill up the vacancy in that diocese. By the members of the Church generally, as well as by those of other religious bodies, he was respected for his learning and personal worth.²

Soon after Bishop Keith's death, Bishop White was elected Primus, but the sees of Caithness, Orkney, and the Isles, re-

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 17. MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, p. 31. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 670. Bishop Dunbar's deed of resignation, among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, No. N. 37, of the Catalogue, and Bishop Gerard's deed of consecration, in the same collection, not numbered in the Catalogue.

² Life of Bishop Keith, prefixed to Bishop Russell's edition of the Historical Catalogue, p. xliii. The first volume of Keith's History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland—the only volume ever published—appeared in 1734. In 1755 when Episcopacy was in its most depressed condition, he published his Historical Catalogue of Scottish Bishops. In regard to the literary labours of Bishop Keith, see Dr. Russell's Life, pp. xxxiv. xxxv. xl. Reference is made by Dr. Russell (p. xxxv. of the Life), and by Mr. Lawson (p. xliii. of the Biographical Sketch prefixed to the Spottiswood Society edition of Keith's History), to a translation, said to have been published by the bishop about the year 1743, of "Select pieces of Thomas a Kempis," the preface to the second volume of which contained addresses to the Virgin Mary; for the insertion of which addresses he thought it necessary to make an explanation to his colleagues. This is substantially correct, though the circumstances are inaccurately related by Dr. Russell and Mr. Lawson. In 1721, there was published at Edinburgh the second volume of "Select Pieces of the reverend and pious Thomas a Kempis, in which are contained two books, viz. I. The Valley of Lilies, II. The Soliloquy of the Soul." In the preface by "the publisher to the English reader," which undoubtedly was written by Keith while a presbyter in Edinburgh, it is stated that the addresses to the Blessed Virgin are omitted "as being most stumbling to the generality of English readers." In some places, however, passages occur, as objectionable as direct addresses to the Virgin. And for this Bishop Keith afterwards apologized in a letter written by him to Bishop Rait, dated 19th October, 1743, a copy of which is among the Papers of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, No. G. 20, of the Catalogue. Keith, while a student at Aberdeen, at the request of Dr. George Garden, translated into Latin the last seven years of Dr. John Forbes's Diary for the Amsterdam edition of the works of that divine; see Dr. Russell's Life, p. xx.

mained vacant for some years. On the feast of All Saints, 1759, Henry Edgar, a presbyter at Arbroath, was consecrated at Cupar in Fife as coadjutor to the Primus, by the Primus, and Bishops Falconer, Rait, and Alexander.¹

After the nomination of Bishop White to the primacy, the clergy of Edinburgh once more endeavoured to bring about an accommodation between themselves and the Episcopal College, but the attempt was without success. They subsequently made choice of one of their own number as bishop, and sent the deed of election to the Primus. The College, however, refused to confirm the appointment.²

King George the Second died on the twenty-fifth of October, 1760.

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 18, 19. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 671. Bishop Edgar was brother of Mr. Edgar, titular Earl of Alford, secretary to the Chevalier; see Riddell's Peerage Law, vol. ii. p. 979.

² Addition to the MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

CHAPTER LXX.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

FROM THE ABJURATION ACT OF APRIL, 1719, TO THE DEPOSITION OF EBENEZER ERSKINE AND THE OTHER MINISTERS OF THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERY IN MAY, 1740.

Changes of opinion in the Presbyterian Church—Case of John Simson—Propositions drawn up by the Presbytery of Auchterarder—Republication of the Marrow of Modern Divinity—Controversy in connection with that work—Opinions of John Glass—He is deposed—Differences on the subject of Patronage—Act of Assembly of 1732 regarding Patronage—Sermon of Ebenezer Erskine—Erskine and three other ministers are suspended—They are deprived of their pastoral charges—Their Secession from the Established Church—They assume the name of the Associate Presbytery—They publish their Testimony—The General Assembly are desirous of an accommodation—The Associate Presbytery refuse to accept the proposed concessions—They publish the Judicial Testimony—They are deposed by the General Assembly.

THE causes which rendered it necessary to treat the history of the Episcopal and the Presbyterian communions under two divisions have already been explained. The narrative is now resumed, so far as connected with the latter body.

The Presbyterians had succeeded in depriving the Episcopal clergy of all support from the government, and in subjecting them to penalties and disabilities. They had also, as formerly mentioned, been able to obtain a modification of the more objectionable provisions of the Abjuration Oath, but all their efforts to procure a repeal of the Patronage Act had been without effect. For many years, however, that statute was seldom enforced in opposition to the wishes of the people; and it was only when a strong feeling favourable to its operation arose in the ecclesiastical courts of the establishment, that a different course was pursued.

A great change of opinion had taken place among many of the Presbyterian ministers. The possession of endowments and the support of the state had produced their usual effects. A party made its appearance which disclaimed all extreme views, and was more disposed to rely on the secular authority, and the favour of the nobility and gentry, than on the zealous attachment of the people; and this party continued to increase in strength, till, at last, it was sufficiently powerful to obtain the ascendancy in the general assembly. The change of opinion was not confined to matters of ecclesiastical polity; it extended also to various points of religious belief and practice, although both parties professed to acquiesce in what was laid down regarding government and doctrine in the formularies of their Church.

Several Presbyterian writers of later times, unwilling to admit that such differences were the natural result of circumstances, have maintained that the introduction of the new opinions was owing, in a great measure, to the influence of the Episcopal clergy who conformed to the establishment. There is no evidence that this was the case. The two parties that gradually assumed a distinct position in the ecclesiastical courts, were the representatives of the same divergences of opinion which had always manifested themselves when Presbyterianism was established—of the royalist and the popular ministers of the reign of James the Sixth, of the Resolutioners and the Protesters of the times of the Covenant. Undoubtedly, the great accession to the lay members of the establishment, from that large body of the higher classes which deserted Episcopacy when it was no longer supported by the state, had a considerable share in the ultimate triumph of the moderate party; but the parochial incumbents who conformed to Presbyterianism after the Revolution were too few in number to produce any marked effect.¹

¹ The exact number of ministers who conformed to the establishment during the reign of William has not been ascertained, but it was not great, probably not more than fifty. On this point an exaggerated opinion seems to have arisen from confounding with those who abandoned Episcopacy altogether, the larger number who took the benefit of the act of 1695, and were allowed in consequence to retain their benefices; but even this will not justify a statement of the commission of the general assembly, in their petition to Queen Anne against the Toleration Act, in which they assert that, “since the late happy establishment,

The differences of opinion existing among the ministers of the establishment became apparent in the proceedings connected with John Simson, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. This person was accused of holding and teaching erroneous doctrines regarding original sin, and other points. By his opponents he was denounced as a Pelagian; and they referred to expressions used by him which seemed fully to justify the charge. His friends defended his language, and he himself maintained that it was in accordance with the established formularies, with which he professed his entire agreement. The proceedings against him extended over many years. His opinions were first brought under public notice in the assembly of 1714, but that body declined to take up the question, allowing, however, his accusers to bring the case before the Presbytery of Glasgow. It was accordingly brought before the latter court, and, from it, before the general assembly of 1717, which censured some of Simson's opinions, as tending to error, and forbade him to teach them, but passed no other sentence against him.

Nearly ten years afterwards, charges of a still more serious nature were brought against Simson. He was accused, not only of teaching the erroneous doctrines formerly condemned, but of holding heretical opinions regarding the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ. He defended himself with ability, but rather with the skill of a practised disputant and metaphysician, than with the plainness which an orthodox Christian

there have been taken in, and continued, hundreds of dissenting ministers upon the easiest terms." (Acts of Assembly p. 468.) Mr. Cunningham (*Church History*, vol. ii. p. 386) points out the mistake of those who attribute a change of policy to the admission of "the Prelatic curates into the ecclesiastical judicatories." Another Presbyterian writer, who shares the common opinion regarding the number of the conforming clergy, denies the influence attributed to them. "It seems a base slander," he says, "that the Episcopal ministers who conformed at the Revolution corrupted the Church of Scotland. The far greater number of them had their abode in the north-east of Scotland, where Episcopacy at one time greatly prevailed; whereas it was about Edinburgh and Glasgow, in Ayrshire and in Galloway, which were famous Covenanting districts, that men arose who were slavish in their political principles, and who defiled and corrupted the pure doctrines of the Gospel with Pelagian and Arian tenets. Let the real apostates from the doctrine of salvation by grace bear the blame; and not those who were innocent. On this point the truth, for some reason or other, has not generally been told." (Struthers's *History of the Rise of the Relief Church*, pp. 189, 190.)

would naturally have shewn in such a case. He declared, however, his belief in the true doctrine of the Trinity, and expressed his regret that his teaching should have given cause of suspicion. The assembly of 1728 found that, though the papers given in by him contained a profession of orthodox belief, he had taught doctrines subversive of the true faith in regard to the Trinity; and they therefore suspended him from preaching and teaching, and from the exercise of all ecclesiastical functions, until another assembly should think fit to take off the sentence. A farther discussion took place in the assembly of the following year; but finally the sentence of suspension was confirmed, one member alone, Thomas Boston, minister at Ettrick, expressing his dissent from the judgment, as too lenient for so serious an offence.¹

The sentence of the general assembly excited a deep feeling of dissatisfaction among some of the zealous ministers, and among a large party of the people, who were beginning, on various grounds, to be dissatisfied with the proceedings of the supreme ecclesiastical court. They contrasted it with the conduct of the assembly in regard to opinions of another kind, connected with a question which had arisen in the interval between the earlier and later stages of Simson's case. That question is known in Scottish ecclesiastical history by the name of the Marrow Controversy.

The Presbytery of Auchterarder, the members of which were zealous opponents of Arminianism, had drawn up certain propositions to which they required all candidates for the ministry to give their assent. One of these was the following:—"I believe that it is not sound and orthodox to teach that we must forsake sin in order to our coming to Christ, and instating us in covenant with God." A candidate who declined to subscribe this, and some other propositions, and who was in consequence refused an extract of his license to preach, appealed to the general assembly. That court, in the

¹ In regard to Simson's Case, see the Acts of the Assembly, pp. 500, 501, 511, 512, 518, 591-593, 603, 604, 607, 608; Boston's *Memoirs*, ed. 1776, p. 437-440; Mc'Kerrow's *History of the Secession Church*, ed. 1841, p. 8, 9, 20-26; and the numerous and minute notices in the *Wodrow Correspondence*. See also the interesting account of the second trial, in Mr. Cunningham's *Church History*, vol. ii. p. 398-413.

year 1717, condemned the proposition as unsound, forbade subscription to be asked to any formula not approved of by the assembly, and ordered the extract to be given.

Several ministers, who sympathized with the views of the Auchterarder Presbytery, endeavoured, by their sermons and otherwise, to counteract what they thought the evil effects of the assembly's sentence. Among those who took part in the movement were Thomas Boston, and James Hog, minister at Carnock. The former, many years before, while visiting one of his people in the parish of Simprin, of which he was then minister, had found the first part of a book compiled during the great rebellion by an English Puritan, named Edward Fisher. This work was entitled "The Marrow of Modern Divinity; part first, touching the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Grace; part second, touching the most plain, pithy, and spiritual exposition of the Ten Commandments." Boston now spoke of the work to some of his friends, who were much pleased with it; and, in the year 1718, it was republished, with a preface by Hog.

The republication of the Marrow of Modern Divinity led to a vehement controversy; some ministers commending it as setting forth the true meaning of the Scriptures, others denouncing it as of Antinomian tendency. The opponents of the book complained of it to the general assembly, and a committee of that body extracted various objectionable passages and expressions, among others, the following, which were called six Antinomian paradoxes:—1. "A believer is not under the law, but is altogether delivered from it. 2. A believer doth not commit sin. 3. The Lord can see no sin in a believer. 4. The Lord is not angry with a believer for his sins. 5. The Lord doth not chastise a believer for his sins. 6. A believer hath no cause, neither to confess his sins, nor to crave pardon at the hand of God for them, neither to fast, nor mourn, nor humble himself before the Lord for them."

The assembly which met in the year 1720 condemned the book, and forbade all ministers to recommend it in any way, enjoining them, on the contrary, to warn their people not to read or use it. The Marrow-men, as its supporters were styled, took steps to obtain another hearing before the assembly; and, for that purpose, they held a meeting at Edinburgh, which

was attended by Ebenezer Erskine, then minister at Portmoak, his brother Ralph Erskine, minister at Dunfermline, Thomas Boston, and others. They gave in a representation to the assembly; but that body, at its meeting in 1722, while it modified to some extent its censure of the book itself, ordered the authors of the representation to be rebuked by the moderator, on account of the injurious reflections contained in their paper. The ministers who subscribed the representation were accordingly admonished. As soon as the moderator had finished his rebuke, one of their number, in name of himself and his brethren, presented a protest against the sentence, but the assembly did not allow it to be received.

These proceedings formed the subject of discussion in most of the synods and presbyteries, and caused the Marrow to be extensively read, among all classes who took an interest in ecclesiastical affairs. The doctrines of the book were nearly the same with those held by the leading divines of the Protestant party in the seventeenth century, and were eagerly supported by all who retained the old Covenanting opinions.¹

¹ Acts of Assembly, pp. 519, 522, 524, 534-536, 548-556. Boston's Memoirs, pp. 173, 330. Struthers's History of Scotland, vol. i. pp. 478-484, 497-510. McKerrow, p. 9-20. Burton, vol. ii. p. 316-319. See also the Wodrow Correspondence, vol. ii. p. 269-271, and the various notices of the Marrow Controversy in that work. Referring to the Marrow of Modern Divinity, Mr. Burton says (vol. ii. p. 317), "The name of its author, Edward Fisher, will not be found in the ordinary biographical dictionaries, but he happens to come within the respectable circle of Anthony Wood's academical notices; and when scoffers insisted that he was but an illiterate barber, it was shewn from the *Athenæ Oxonienses*, that he was the son of a knight, and was a gentleman commoner of Brazen Nose, noted for his knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and his skill in ancient languages. His book, indeed, bears testimony to scholarship, though its doctrines were not those which generally prevailed at the fountains of English learning. It drew from the writings of Luther and other fathers of the Reformation, their views on such great questions as justification and sanctification, and delivered them in a lively and fervent dialogue." A notice of Edward Fisher, son of Sir Edward Fisher of Mickleton in Gloucestershire, and a gentleman commoner of Brazen Nose College, is inserted in the *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. iii. p. 407-409. Among the works ascribed to him in that notice is the Marrow of Modern Divinity; but it is probable that the author of the Marrow was a different person, since this Edward Fisher was a royalist, who wrote against the Sabbatarians, and who, as Wood thinks, was also the author of a tract, entitled "The Feast of Feasts: or the celebration of the sacred Nativity of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; grounded upon the Scriptures, and confirmed by the practice of the Christian Church in all ages."

Soon after the conclusion of the proceedings in the Marrow controversy, an attack was made on the established Church by one of its ministers, whose peculiar principles were very different from those held by either party in the late dispute. John Glass, minister at Tealing, in the county of Angus, had adopted several tenets resembling those of the Independents. He denied the authority of the National Covenant, and of the Solemn League and Covenant, maintaining that such obligations partook rather of a Jewish than of a Christian character, and that they were inconsistent with the principles of religious liberty, and the rights of conscience. He denied, on the one hand, the power of the civil magistrate in church affairs, and contended, on the other, that it was unlawful to uphold Christianity by force of arms; weapons of a different kind being alone permitted in defence of religion. There were many important truths in the teaching of Glass; but, in no Christian country, was the advocate of such a cause less likely to make disciples, than in Scotland at that time. He was summoned before the ecclesiastical courts, and, in the year 1730, was deposed by the commission of the general assembly. In 1739, when the ruling party in the established Church was struggling against more formidable opponents, of whom an account will immediately be given, he was restored to his character of a preacher of the Gospel, though not to his office of a parochial minister. He had some followers, but they were neither numerous nor influential. The sect which he founded continues to exist in Scotland. Its opinions were considerably modified by Robert Sandeman, a son-in-law of its founder, from whom its members received the name of Sandemanians.¹

As time went on, the statute restoring patronage, from being almost a dead letter, became an important element in the practical system of the Church. The differences in matters of doctrine, which the proceedings against Simson and the Marrow controversy had brought to light, increased the hostility of

¹ Wodrow Correspondence, vol. iii. pp. 458-460, 481, 482. Morren's Annals of the General Assembly, vol. i. p. 10. Burton, vol. ii. p. 345-347. Glass professed to adhere literally to the precepts of Scripture, in regard to the celebration of divine worship. Wodrow, writing in 1730, says, "We have some stories here, as if Mr. Glass and his company were bringing in some surprising novelties, as the holy kiss, saying Amen, the use of the Lord's Prayer, &c. But we know not what to believe."

the two parties. The moderate party had now acquired a majority in the general assembly, and was disposed to maintain the rights of patrons in opposition to the mere wishes of the parishioners. When the inferior courts disregarded the opposition of a reluctant congregation, they were, in most instances, supported by the supreme court; but when, as was frequently the case, the presbyteries sympathised with the people, the assembly had a more invidious and difficult task to discharge. It became necessary for them, under such circumstances, either to acquiesce in the rejection of the presentee, or to enforce obedience to the law, notwithstanding the resistance of the inferior judicatory. They had recourse to an expedient, which was sanctioned by the practice of their predecessors in the time of the Covenant for the similar purpose of maintaining the ascendancy of the general assembly. They appointed a committee of their own number, or of members holding their own opinions in the synods and presbyteries adjoining the vacant parish, with authority and instructions to admit the presentee.

Unable to offer effectual opposition otherwise, the ministers in the minority lodged protestations and remonstrances, often of great length, against the resolutions of the majority. An attempt was made to stop this practice by an act of assembly in 1730, which forbade reasons of dissent against the determination of ecclesiastical judicatories to be entered on the records. This act increased the discontent of those against whom it was directed; but another, which was passed soon afterwards, was attended with more serious consequences.

The assembly had not only to consider how the right of presentation was to be made effectual in the hands of the lay patron, but how it was to be administered when it belonged to the Church. The old rule of the canon law was still kept up, by which the right of presentation, when not exercised within due time, became vested, for that particular occasion, in the Church itself. If the patron failed to exercise his right within six months, the presentation belonged, *jure devoluto*, to the presbytery. From carelessness, or reluctance to insist on an unpopular appointment, patrons frequently allowed their right to lapse; and the presbyteries, in availing themselves of their privilege, sometimes filled up the benefice by a direct nomina-

tion, sometimes permitted the people to make choice of a minister. It was thought desirable that a uniform rule should be established in this respect. An overture was accordingly agreed to by the assembly of 1731, and, in terms of the Barrier Act, was transmitted to the various presbyteries, by which it was proposed that, in all such cases, the election should be in the elders and Protestant heritors, and, in royal burghs, in the magistrates, town councils, and elders; and that the choice made by them should be submitted to the congregation for its approval, the election to be sustained if so approved of, if otherwise, the reasons of disapproval to be laid before the presbytery, which was to judge finally in the matter.

This was substantially a re-introduction of the system which, in terms of the statute of 1690, had been in operation before the act of Queen Anne; but it was disagreeable to a considerable party in the Church, which insisted on the divine right of the people to choose their own ministers, and to many others who, without taking that ground, were unwilling to give any facilities to the operation of the law of patronage. When the overture was transmitted to the presbyteries, it is said that thirty-one of them rejected it; that only six approved of it altogether; that twelve gave a conditional sanction with reference to some proposed amendments; and that eighteen made no report whatever. The assembly of 1732 held, on very insufficient grounds, that, as a majority of all the presbyteries had not directly opposed it, the general opinion of the Church was in its favour; and they accordingly passed it into a law. Against this decision Ebenezer Erskine and other ministers protested, but their protest was not received. Two papers containing a representation of ecclesiastical grievances were also rejected by the same assembly. One of these documents was signed by forty-two ministers, and three elders; the other by upwards of seventeen hundred members of the Church.¹

¹ Acts of Assembly, pp. 612, 614, 620, 621. Gib's Display of the Secession Testimony, vol. i. pp. 25, 26. Struthers, vol. i. p. 598-619. M'Kerrow, p. 31-41. According to Sir Henry Moncreiff (Life of Dr. John Erskine, p. 443), the overture of 1731 was passed into a law by the assembly of 1732 without being transmitted to the presbyteries; but this statement appears to be erroneous.

While the majority thus shewed its determination to uphold the authority of the assembly, an event occurred, which marked the firm resolution of the leaders of the opposition to maintain their peculiar views as to the questions in dispute. At the opening meeting of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, in October, 1732, Ebenezer Erskine, now minister at Stirling, preached the sermon. His text was the twenty-second verse of the hundred and eighteenth Psalm, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is made the head-stone of the corner;" and, in connection with the conduct of the Jewish rulers, he made express reference to the Toleration and Patronage Acts, and to the recent measures of the general assembly. The members of the synod were generally opposed to the opinions of the preacher, and ordered a committee of their body to prepare a report on the objectionable parts of the sermon. The committee, after vainly endeavouring to prevail on Erskine to apologize, gave in their report, and the synod, by a majority of votes, censured the discourse; the minority protesting against the decision, and appealing to the general assembly. The assembly of 1733 approved of the proceedings of the synod, and ordered the offending preacher to be rebuked at the bar.

Erskine had made up his mind not to submit in silence to the admonition. When the rebuke was pronounced by the moderator, he gave in a protest, to which three members of the Synod of Perth adhered, William Wilson, minister at Perth, Alexander Moncrieff, minister at Abernethy, and James Fisher, minister at Kinclaven. Indignant that its authority should be questioned, the assembly summoned the four ministers to appear the next day, and, as they declined to withdraw their paper, the following resolution was agreed to by a large majority:—"The general assembly ordains that the four brethren aforesaid appear before the commission in August next, and then shew their sorrow for their conduct and misbehaviour in offering to protest, and in giving in to this assembly the paper by them subscribed; and that they then retract the same. And in case they do not appear before the

The preamble to the Act of Assembly of 1734, which repealed the act of 1732, implies that the latter was passed, though in an irregular manner; but it does not enter into particulars.

said commission in August, and then shew their sorrow, and retract, as said is, the commission is hereby empowered and appointed to suspend the said brethren, or such of them as shall not obey, from the exercise of their ministry. And further, in case the said brethren shall be suspended by the said commission, and that they shall act contrary to the said sentence of suspension, the commission is hereby empowered and appointed, at their meeting in November or any subsequent meeting, to proceed to a higher censure against the said four brethren, or such of them as shall continue to offend by transgressing this act. And the general assembly do appoint the several presbyteries, of which the said brethren are members, to report to the commission in August, and subsequent meetings of it, their conduct and behaviour with respect to this act."

At the meeting of the commission in August, the four ministers still adhered to their protest, and were in consequence suspended from the exercise of their ministerial functions. Against this sentence they lodged the following protestation :—" We hereby adhere to the protestation taken by us before this court, for ourselves, and in name of all the ministers, elders, and members of the Church of Scotland, and of all and every one in our respective congregations adhering to us, bearing that this sentence is in itself null and void, and that it shall be lawful and warrantable for us to exercise our ministry, as hitherto we have done, and as if no such censure had been inflicted : and that, if in consequence of this sentence any minister or probationer shall exercise any part of our pastoral work, the same shall be held and reputed as a violent intrusion upon our ministerial labours."

The suspended ministers having continued to exercise their several functions, they were summoned to appear before the meeting of the commission in November. Its proceedings were watched with great anxiety by all members of the established Church, and petitions for lenient treatment of the ministers were presented from seven synods. The commission was divided in opinion as to the propriety of proceeding to a more severe sentence ; but it was carried by the casting vote of the moderator to go on. Two motions were made ; one, to depose the four ministers simpliciter, the other, to loose their

relation with their several charges, to declare them no longer ministers of the established Church, and to prohibit all members of that Church from employing them in any ministerial function. The latter and milder of the two sentences was agreed to. The four ministers having been called in, the sentence was intimated by the moderator, whereupon they read the following paper :—" We do hereby adhere to the protestations formerly entered before this court, both at their last meeting in August, and when we appeared first before this meeting. And further, we do protest, in our own name, and in the name of all and every one in our respective congregations adhering to us, that, notwithstanding of this sentence passed against us, our pastoral relation shall be held and reputed firm and valid. And likewise we do protest that, notwithstanding of our being cast out from ministerial communion with the established Church of Scotland, we still hold communion with all and every one who desire, with us, to adhere to the principles of the true Presbyterian, Covenanted Church of Scotland, in her doctrine, worship, government, and discipline, and particularly with every one who is groaning under the evils, and who is afflicted with the grievances we have been complaining of, who are, in their several spheres, wrestling against the same. But in regard the prevailing party in this established Church, who have now cast us out from ministerial communion with them, are carrying on a course of defection from our Reformed and Covenanted principles, and, particularly, are suppressing ministerial freedom and faithfulness in testifying against the present backslidings of the Church, and inflicting censures upon ministers for witnessing by protestations, and otherwise, against the same; therefore we do, for these and many other weighty reasons to be laid open in due time, protest, that we are obliged to make a secession from them, and that we can have no ministerial communion with them, till they see their sins and mistakes, and amend them. And, in like manner, we do protest, that it shall be lawful and warrantable for us to exercise the keys of Doctrine, Discipline, and Government, according to the Word of God and Confession of Faith, and the principles and constitution of the Church of Scotland, as if no such censure had been passed upon us. Upon all which we take instruments.

And we hereby appeal unto the first free, faithful, and reforming general assembly of the Church of Scotland.”¹

In December, 1733, the four ministers met at Gairney Bridge, near Kinross, to deliberate on the course now to be adopted, and agreed to form themselves into a presbytery. They assumed the name of The Associate Presbytery; and Erskine was elected to the office of moderator, and Fisher to that of clerk. By this act, they not only declared their intention of continuing to officiate as ministers, notwithstanding the sentence pronounced against them, but also of establishing a distinct body, capable, according to the principles of their communion, of exercising all the essential powers of a Church. Before they separated, they ordered a paper to be drawn up, which they afterwards published, under the title of “A Testimony to the Doctrine, Worship, Government, and Discipline of the Church of Scotland.”

This Testimony contained a statement of the principles of the Seceders, and of the reasons which induced them to withdraw from the establishment. It began with a brief historical narrative of ecclesiastical events in Scotland from the time of the Reformation. While acknowledging the benefits received from the Revolution of 1688, they lamented the want of fervour which prevailed on that occasion, in consequence of which the Church never resumed the glorious appearance which it had from 1638 to 1650. They deplored the effects of the Union, by which the Scottish kingdom was incorporated with that of England in a way very different from the Covenant union of the previous century, and denounced the Patronage and Toleration Acts as the source of many evils. They then referred to the encouragement of Arian and Arminian errors in the universities, and to various other corruptions and defects, particularly the support given to patronage by the act of assembly of 1732. They next explained the reasons of their secession from the prevailing party in the Church, mentioning the various charges which they had to make against the conduct of that party. These were, first, That they were breaking down their Presbyterian constitution; secondly,

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 624-626. Gib's Display, vol. i. p. 26-35. Struthers, vol. i. p. 619-643. M'Kerrow, p. 43-64. See also Erskine's sermon at the opening of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, printed at the time.

That they were corrupting the Confession of Faith ; thirdly, That they imposed sinful terms of ministerial communion, by restraining ministerial freedom and faithfulness in testifying against the course of defection and backsliding ; fourthly, That these corrupt courses were carried with a high hand, notwithstanding the efforts used to stop the current of defection ; and, lastly, That matters were now come to such a pass, that the protesting brethren were excluded from keeping up a proper testimony against the backslidings of the prevailing party, in the way of ministerial communion with them. They added a declaration of their own principles, in which they professed their adherence to the doctrine, polity, and discipline of the established Church, as contained in the Scriptures, the Confession of Faith, the Catechism, and the Directory ; and testified their belief in the perpetual obligation of the National Covenant, and of the Solemn League and Covenant.

It soon became evident that the seceding ministers possessed the sympathy, not only of many of their brethren, but of large numbers of the people. Exertions were made throughout the kingdom to procure the return to the general assembly of 1734 of such commissioners as would be disposed to support conciliatory measures. That body met as usual in the month of May, and its proceedings shewed an earnest desire to bring back Erskine and his friends to the communion of the Church. The act of 1730 against entering reasons of dissent on the record, and the act of 1732 in regard to filling up vacant parishes, were repealed ; and express power was given to the Synod of Perth to take the case of the four brethren into consideration, and to do what might be thought best for replacing them in their former charges, and restoring peace to the Church.

The Synod of Perth met in July, and, in virtue of the powers conferred upon them, unanimously agreed to alter the sentence of the commission, and to restore the four brethren to their ministerial functions, and parochial charges. It was confidently expected that this measure would have the desired effect of restoring peace and harmony. The Presbytery of Stirling, anxious to show their respect for Erskine, elected him as their moderator, and appointed a deputation of their number to wait upon him, and request him to accept the office.

Erskine declined the offer ; and, at a meeting of the Associate Presbytery which took place soon afterwards, it was resolved not to accept the concessions made, because the various grievances specified in their late Testimony were not fully redressed.

The assembly had exercised its powers in an arbitrary manner, when it deprived the four ministers for protesting against its acts ; and those ministers were now yet more blameworthy in rejecting the proposals for an accommodation. It is seldom that an ecclesiastical body has been prevailed upon to repeal its own acts, in order to bring back to its communion those who have deserted and disowned it. This course, however, was adopted by the assembly, and, so far as appears, in a spirit of Christian humility and charity ; but it had no effect. Erskine and his friends were determined to remain in a self-chosen state of separation.

Many members of the established Church, who sympathised with the opinions of the Associate Presbytery in regard to doctrine and polity, lamented the course on which they were now entering. Those, however, who thought that the popular election of ministers was a principle to be maintained at all hazards, entirely approved of the recent conduct of the Seceders. A considerable number of the persons who held this opinion had withdrawn themselves from the parish churches in which ministers had been settled under the law of patronage, and met apart for religious worship, without any authorised teacher. Several of them now petitioned the Associate Presbytery for what, in the ecclesiastical language of Presbyterianism, is styled "Supply of Sermon," and requested that body to exercise its authority, by granting licenses to properly qualified persons to preach the Gospel. The Associate Presbytery agreed to assist the petitioners, so far as they themselves could ; but, in the meantime, they gave no definite answer as to licensing others. Applications of a similar character were afterwards made by the remnant of the Cameronians, who, at this time, had no preacher in their communion, and by some Presbyterians in Ulster, who complained that their presbytery

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 627-629. Gib's Display, vol. i. p. 36-50. Struthers, vol. ii. p. 1-21. M'Kerrow, p. 71-92. See also the Testimony of the four ministers.

had forced a minister upon them in opposition to their wishes.

In the end of the year 1736, the Associate Presbytery set forth a document called an "Act, Declaration, and Testimony for the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Church of Scotland," which, by way of distinction from the previous paper of the same kind, came to be known as the Judicial Testimony. This document was mainly an enlargement of the historical narrative prefixed to the former Testimony, and concluded with a similar declaration of belief. Having about the same time agreed to prepare young men for the ministry, they afterwards resolved to grant them license to preach. This was done in order to meet the increasing demands for assistance from various parts of the kingdom, which they were entirely unable to supply otherwise, although they had been joined by several ministers, among whom was Ralph Erskine.¹

As the Associate Presbytery continued to act in all respects as an independent body, and to exercise jurisdiction, not only over the congregations of its own members, but over all who applied for assistance, various representations on the subject were made to the general assembly. It was evident that that court, if desirous to preserve its own authority as the chief ecclesiastical judicatory of the establishment, could not safely overlook such irregularities. Instructions were therefore given to the commission, in the year 1738, to take steps for bringing the Seceding ministers before the next meeting of the assembly; and the members of the Associate Presbytery were accordingly cited to appear in May, 1739, and to answer for their secession, their publication of the Testimony, and their other offences. They resolved to appear at the bar of the assembly, but only for the purpose of formally declining its jurisdiction. When they presented themselves, it was not as individual ministers, but as a regular ecclesiastical court, headed by their moderator; and, having lodged their declinature, they retired from the meeting. The assembly resolved, before proceeding to extreme measures, to summon them once more to appear in the following year, with an expression of opinion, that all who did not retract before that time should be deposed.

¹ M'Kerrow, p. 92-126. Struthers, vol. ii. pp. 24. 25.

The assembly met again in May, 1740. The seceding brethren were summoned, but now declined to appear. By a majority of one hundred and forty to thirty it was agreed to proceed to a sentence of deposition; and accordingly the two Erskines, and the other members of the Associate Presbytery, were deposed from their office of the ministry, and their several churches were declared vacant.

The historian of the Secession Church makes the following remarks on the deposition of its founders:—"The reader will naturally ask, for what was it these good men were deposed from the office of the holy ministry? Was it because they were chargeable with error in doctrine? Was it because they were immoral in practice? Was it because they held principles at variance with the constitution of the Church of Scotland? No; they were eminently distinguished for their soundness in the faith, for the purity of their lives, and for their warm attachment to the constitution of that Church from which they were expelled. In these respects, even their worst enemies could not affix the slightest stain upon their character. The people revered them for their piety, and by not a few of their brethren in the ministry were they held in high esteem as good and conscientious men. Why then were they subjected to the highest ecclesiastical censure that can be inflicted on a minister of the Gospel? The simple answer to this question is, that they were deposed because they had formed themselves into a presbytery, for the purpose of giving to their countrymen a pure dispensation of Gospel ordinances, unfettered by the laws of patronage, and other acts of parliament. They were deposed because they refused any longer to co-operate with the established judicatories in carrying on that system of ecclesiastical tyranny which had been pursued by them for such a number of years." To this explanation he prefixes the remark, that "it will be difficult to find in the records of any ecclesiastical court a sentence more unjust and tyrannical than that which the assembly at this time pronounced against the fathers of the Secession." Dr. M'Kerrow's statement of facts is substantially correct, but his opinion regarding them, which would be reasonable enough if proceeding from an Independent, is unfair on Presbyterian principles. When the seceding ministers deliberately formed themselves into a distinct

ecclesiastical body, and persisted for years in standing aloof from their brethren, though earnestly entreated to return to the communion of the established Church, the general assembly cannot be blamed for proceeding at last to a sentence of deposition. It is not enough to say that the separatists maintained the polity and doctrines of Presbyterianism more rigidly than their opponents. They might have continued to do so within the establishment, protesting against those measures which they disapproved ; but, when they seceded from it, and disowned its governing body as essentially corrupt, they had no right to complain that they were ejected from its communion.¹

¹ Acts of Assembly, pp. 646, 647, 649-651, 653, 655. Morren's *Annals of the General Assembly*, vol. i. pp. 3-10, 15-18. M'Kerrow, p. 126-136. Struthers, vol. ii. p. 42-53.

CHAPTER LXXXI.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

FROM THE DEPOSITION OF ERSKINE AND THE OTHER MINISTERS OF THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERY IN MAY, 1740, TO THE DEATH OF KING GEORGE II. IN OCTOBER, 1760.

Dissensions among the Seceders—George Whitefield visits Scotland—His correspondence with the Seceders—His quarrel with them—Revival at Cambuslang—John Wesley visits Scotland—Results of his preaching—The Seceders renew the Covenants—Differences among them as to the Burgess Oath—Their separation into Burghers and Antiburghers—Death of Ebenezer Erskine—Efforts of the established ministers to obtain an augmentation of their Stipends—The disputes regarding Patronage—Case of Inverkeithing—Deposition of Thomas Gillespie—Formation of the Relief Presbytery—Proposal in the General Assembly to censure the writings of David Hume—Proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts regarding John Home's Tragedy of Douglas—State of the Established Church at the end of the reign of George the Second.

THE conduct of the seceding ministers themselves had already shewn that any attempt to bring about a reconciliation of the two parties was hopeless; but the act of the general assembly of 1740 made the separation formally complete. The members of the Associate Presbytery were cheered by the support of their own people, and by the sympathy of many strict Presbyterians throughout the kingdom. Petty attempts were indeed made to annoy them in some quarters, and individuals among their congregations were exposed to oppression from their landlords, but such persecutions were rather vexatious than seriously hurtful.

The Seceders had more to fear from internal dissensions. Within less than a twelvemonth after their deposition, the members of the Associate Presbytery differed among themselves, as to the propriety of appointing a public fast on the

same day which was fixed by the crown on the application of the commission of the general assembly. The majority opposed such a proceeding as an acknowledgment of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the sovereign, or, as they styled it in language similar to that which was formerly used by the Covenanters, an invasion of the headship of Christ. The minority, including the two Erskines, saw no harm in holding a fast, by their own authority, on the day previously assigned by the civil power, and observed by their fellow subjects. The ministers in the minority were prevented from entering a dissent only by the consideration of the triumph which such a circumstance would afford to the opponents of the Secession.¹

In the year 1741, George Whitefield, the leader of one of the parties of the English Methodists, came to Scotland on the invitation of the Erskines. There were many points of difference between him and the Seceders, but they were attracted towards each other by their common Calvinism, as well as by their sincere and ardent piety. The preliminary correspondence might have prepared the members of the Associate Presbytery for what followed. They explained to Whitefield their views of ecclesiastical polity, and wished him to confine his ministrations to their communion. He answered that he could not altogether adopt their suggestion, as he meant to come to Scotland "only as an occasional preacher, to preach the simple Gospel to all who were willing to hear him, of whatever denomination;" and that he could not "join in a reformation as to church government any farther than he had light given him from above."

When Whitefield arrived, he proceeded to Dunfermline, and preached his first sermon in the parish church there, which was still occupied by Ralph Erskine. In the month of August, a conference took place between him and the members of the Associate Presbytery, concerning the form of church government enjoined by the Scriptures.

In the Secession account of this conference, it is stated that Whitefield enquired, "whether the Presbyterian government be that which is agreeable to the pattern shewn in the mount; and, if so, whether it excluded a toleration of those who might

¹ M'Kerrow, p. 136-150.

not have the same views, such as Independents, Anabaptists, and Episcopalians, among whom there are good men." Ebenezer Erskine answered, "Sir, God has made you an instrument of gathering a great multitude of souls to the faith and profession of the Gospel of Christ, throughout England and also in foreign parts; and now it is fit that you should be considering how that body is to be organized and preserved, which cannot be done without following the example of Paul and Barnabas, who, when they had gathered churches by the preaching of the Gospel, visited them again and ordained over them elders in every city, which you cannot do alone, without some two or three met together in a judicative capacity, in the name of the Lord." Whitefield replied, that he thought his present duty was to preach the Gospel without proceeding to any such work. The brethren attempted to shew that neither Episcopacy nor Independency had any foundation in the word of God; but he remained unconvinced, stating that, in his opinion, church government was not a matter of much importance, and that he was resolved to continue in the communion of the Church of England. The Associate Presbytery in consequence came to the determination not to hear him in the meantime, nor to ask his assistance in any ministerial labours.

According to Whitefield's own narrative, he asked the Associate Presbytery what they wished him to do. They answered, "That they did not desire him to subscribe immediately to the Solemn League and Covenant, but to preach only for them, till he had farther light." "Why only for them," he asked. Ralph Erskine replied, "They were the Lord's people." He asked, "Were no other the Lord's people but themselves? If not, and if others were the devil's people, they have more need to be preached to; that, for his part, all places were alike to him, and that if the Pope himself would lend him his pulpit, he would gladly proclaim in it the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ."

The result of the conference led to an absolute quarrel between the parties. It could hardly indeed have been otherwise. A zealous Presbyterian writer remarks, "No two things could be more discordant than the principles adopted by the Seceders, and those by which Whitefield professed to be guided. To unite Christians in a uniform profession of divine

truth, that guarded by the strictest discipline might be transmitted pure and entire from one generation to another, was the object of Seceders; to produce sudden and extraordinary effects, with less regard to external means for rendering them permanent, was the great aim of Mr. Whitefield."

Rejected by the Seceders, Whitefield was welcomed by a considerable number of those ministers of the established Church, who in regard to doctrine coincided with the members of the Associate Presbytery, but shrunk from an actual separation. He preached, along with them, both in the parish churches and in the open air, and joined with them in dispensing the communion. One of his chief supporters was William M'Culloch, minister of the parish of Cambuslang, who circulated among his congregation accounts of the wonderful revivals which had taken place under Whitefield's preaching, and endeavoured, by his own sermons and otherwise, to produce a similar effect. His exertions were successful. One of those displays of excited feeling took place, which hitherto had been little known in Scotland, except in connection with the sermons of some of the Covenanting preachers of the previous century. Before this event, Whitefield had returned to England, but he now made a second visit to the North, and came to Cambuslang. While he was there, the communion was celebrated. "Scarce ever," he says, "was such a sight seen in Scotland. There were undoubtedly upwards of twenty thousand persons. Two tents were set up, and the holy sacrament was administered in the fields. When I began to serve a table, the power of God was felt by numbers; but the people crowded so upon me that I was obliged to desist, and go to preach at one of the tents, while the ministers served the rest of the tables. God was with them and with his people. There was preaching all day by one or another, and in the evening, when the sacrament was over, at the request of the ministers, I preached to the whole congregation. I preached about an hour and a half. Surely it was a time much to be remembered. On Monday morning, I preached again to near as many; but such an universal stir I never saw before. The motion fled as swift as lightning from one end of the auditory to another. You might have seen thousands bathed in tears, some at the same

time wringing their hands, others almost swooning, and others crying out and mourning over a pierced Saviour." After this time the excitement gradually subsided, as daily sermons were given up, and the preaching was transferred from the open air to the parish church.

The general effect of Whitefield's sermons was viewed with different feelings by various parties in Scotland. The friends of the preacher regarded it as a manifest, and almost miraculous, interposition of divine providence; his opponents, and conspicuously among them the Seceders, as a delusion, and a work of the devil. The Associate Presbytery appointed a special day of fasting and humiliation on account of these proceedings. In reference to the so-called revival, they said, "It is obvious that bitter outcryings, faintings, severe bodily pains, convulsions, voices, visions, and revelations, are the usual symptoms of a delusive spirit, that have appeared in the Quakers, Cevennois, Camisars, and other enthusiasts; and which no sound divine amongst us hath ever maintained as agreeable to and concerned with the saving operations of the Spirit of God. Nor will any of the fruits of this work, that have hitherto been alleged, be sufficient to difference it either from the common work of the Spirit of God upon hypocrites, or from the delusions of Satan; but the following fruits and effects of it are undeniably evident, namely, the warmest aversion and opposition to a testimony for those very same principles which have been sworn to and suffered for with blood in these lands, the closest conjunction with their ministers, though they are continuing to bear down these principles with a high hand, whether intruders or not, and a visible neglect in many of them of their relative and stational duties, contrary to the practice of scriptural converts, and the experience of the saints of God in this land, who, upon their conversion, still espoused the testimony of their day, and contended for the present truth: which delusive spirit, if the Lord of his mercy prevents it not, may run out to a great length, to the throwing off of all religious and civil obligations, and involve these lands in the saddest calamities and direful confusions, as it has done in other kingdoms and states before, such as Germany, France, and other places."¹

¹ Struthers, vol. ii. p. 59-72. M'Kerrow, p. 150-171. Moncreiff's *Life of Dr.*

It was ten years after Whitefield's first visit to Scotland before the leader of the other great division of the Methodists came thither ; but it will be convenient to notice at this place the introduction of the Wesleyan Society into the northern kingdom. Whitefield, in the course of several visits, had made many converts, and had produced a strong effect on the religious feelings of the Scottish people ; but he had not founded any separate ecclesiastical body, and, as already intimated, it was no part of his method of proceeding to do so. John Wesley, a man of far higher intellectual powers, sought to establish a society under his own rule ; though for many years he endeavoured to persuade himself and others that in this there was nothing inconsistent with his duty as a priest of the English Church. He visited Scotland at various times. Before his first journey, he was warned by Whitefield that his known Arminian opinions would raise a strong feeling against him in that country ; and he entered it without his usual confidence in his own power as a preacher to overcome all difficulties. His sermons were generally listened to with attention ; but he made little real progress. The Presbyterians, however divided in other respects, were strict Calvinists in doctrine, and were attached to a system of ecclesiastical government which left no room for the Wesleyan discipline.

Wesley complained both of the bigotry and of the coldness of the Scottish character, and asserted that the Seceders were more uncharitable than the Papists. "I have not yet," he said, "met a Papist in this kingdom who would tell me to my face, all but themselves must be damned ; but I have seen Seceders enough who make no scruple to affirm, none but themselves could be saved." When preaching at Glasgow on a week-day, "the congregation," he says, "was miserably small, verifying what I had often heard before, that the Scotch dearly love the word of the Lord—on the Lord's-day. If I live to come again, I will take care to spend only the Lord's-day at Glasgow." At Dundee, he professed to admire the people, "so devout, so serious, and so perfectly unconcerned." At the same place he made a formal answer to various objec-

John Erskine, p. 92-114. Southey's *Life of Wesley*, 3d ed. vol. ii. pp. 121-127, 133-135. Dr. M'Kerrow questions, on very insufficient grounds, the correctness of Whitefield's account of his conference with the Seceders.

tions of the Presbyterians. "He was a member of the Church of England, but he loved good men of every Church. He always used a short private prayer when he attended the public service of God; why did not they do the same? Was it not according to the Bible? He stood whenever he was singing the praises of God in public; were there not plain precedents for this in Scripture? He always knelt before the Lord when he prayed in public, and generally in public he used the Lord's Prayer, because Christ had taught us, when we pray, to say, Our Father which art in heaven." His tastes and feelings, as well as his principles, made him dislike the character of the Scottish Reformation. Standing among the ruins of Aberbrothock, he exclaimed, "God deliver us from reforming mobs;" and he denounced the folly of the excuses generally made for Knox and his associates. "I know," he observed, "it is commonly said the work to be done *needed* such a spirit. Not so: the work of God does not, cannot *need* the work of the devil to forward it. And a calm, even spirit goes through rough work far better than a furious one. Although, therefore, God did use, at the time of the Reformation, sour, overbearing, passionate men, yet he did not use them *because* they were such, but *notwithstanding* they were so. And there is no doubt He would have used them much more, had they been of a humbler and milder spirit." On these accounts he was perhaps the more attracted towards the members of the Episcopal Church, mentioning that the decorum with which public worship was conducted among them exceeded any thing he had seen in England, and that even his own congregations did not come up to it.

The preaching of Wesley and his disciples made Methodism known throughout Scotland, and congregations were gathered in several of the towns. But its principles made less rapid progress there than in any other part of the British Islands, and it never acquired much influence among the people.¹

For some years after its formation, the governing body of the Secession communion was deficient in one of the essential features of the Presbyterian polity. The Associate Presbytery, the only judicatory, was composed of ministers alone, because the lay-elders of their several kirk-sessions had not,

¹ Southey's *Life of Wesley*, vol. ii. p. 135-146.

as a body, left the establishment. By degrees the elders followed the example of their ministers, and were assumed as members of the Presbytery. In 1744, the congregations had become too numerous for one ecclesiastical court. The members of the Associate Presbytery therefore formed themselves into a synod, under the title of "The Associate Synod," consisting of three presbyteries, the names of which mark the districts where the adherents of the Secession were strongest—Dunfermline, Glasgow, and Edinburgh.

While these changes were going on, the Seceders endeavoured, by various proceedings, to shew more strongly the contrast between themselves and the establishment. They passed an act concerning the doctrine of grace, in opposition to the decision of the general assembly in the Marrow controversy. They also resolved, by a formal act, to renew the obligation of the Covenants. In doing so, they recognized the duty of obedience to civil rulers, though these rulers should not themselves maintain the Covenant. On account of this acknowledgment, one of their ministers, who held the Cameronian tenets on the subject of allegiance to the state, renounced their communion, appealing to the first faithful reforming judicatory; and, at one of their meetings, he mounted the pulpit, and summoned them to appear before the judgment seat of God to answer for their conduct.

In renewing the Covenants, the Seceders shewed a becoming degree of moderation in some points, swearing to endeavour the reformation of religion in England and Ireland, only by such means as were lawful and warrantable, and according to the word of God, and the standards of their Church. It was resolved that the renewal of the National Covenant, and of the Solemn League and Covenant, in the manner now agreed upon, should be "the term of ministerial communion," and also "of Christian communion in the admission of people to sealing ordinances;" but it appears that, in so far at least as the people were concerned, this obligation was at no time strictly enforced.¹

The Seceders had separated from the established Church in order to carry out their own views of ecclesiastical polity with entire freedom. They soon found, however, that it was almost

¹ Struthers, vol. ii. pp. 72, 90-97, 550. M'Kerrow, p. 172-197.

as difficult to remain at unity among themselves, as it had been to act in concert with the moderate party in the body which they had left. The difference as to keeping a fast ordered by the civil authority has already been referred to. At the very first meeting of the new Associate Synod, indications were given of an approaching contest on a subject of still less importance. By the municipal institutions of the three burghs of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Perth, all burgesses had to take an oath in the following form:—“I protest before God, that I profess and allow with my heart the true religion presently professed within this realm, and authorized by the laws thereof; I shall abide thereat, and defend the same to my life’s end, renouncing the Roman religion called Papistry.” One party among the Seceders held that these words implied an approbation of the established Church, and of all its corruptions, against which they had so solemnly protested; the others thought that no such meaning could reasonably be attached to them. Violent discussions took place at several meetings of the Associate Synod in regard to the lawfulness of the Burgess Oath. In April, 1746, the majority condemned the oath, and ordered all who had taken it to express their submission to the judgment so pronounced. In April of the following year, the Associate Synod so far altered this judgment, as to declare that the previous decision should not be made a term of ministerial or Christian communion, until first referred to the presbyteries and kirk-sessions for their opinion. The minority on this latter occasion, being nearly one half of the synod, refused to acknowledge the lawfulness of the vote; and, separating from their brethren, they assembled on the following day, in the house of Adam Gib, a leading minister of their party, and continued their sittings as a synod.

The separation thus unhappily begun was continued. Each party claimed the name and authority of the Associate Synod, but the one which refused absolutely to condemn the oath became known as the Burgher Synod, the other as the Anti-burgher Synod. The former body was willing to come to an accommodation, but the latter declined to do so, and finally carried matters so far as to summon the leading persons among their opponents to appear at the bar of their synod in

April, 1748. As none of the Burgher brethren paid any attention to the summons, they were declared contumacious, and were suspended from the exercise of their ministerial functions. At subsequent meetings they were first deposed from the office of the ministry, and afterwards were excommunicated. Among those against whom these censures were pronounced were Ebenezer Erskine and his brother Ralph.

Such was the deplorable result of this controversy in regard to a question in itself so insignificant and absurd. It is as unnecessary, as it would be unprofitable, to dwell on the contests and strife which followed the breaking up of the Seceding communion. The party to which the Erskines belonged was more moderate during the progress of the dispute, and was not provoked to acts of retaliation by the conduct of its opponents. Ralph Erskine died in November, 1752. Ebenezer did not long survive. When told of his brother's death, he said, "And is Ralph gone? He has twice got the start of me; he was first in Christ, and now he is first in glory." Soon afterwards he thus wrote to a friend, "According to the course of nature, it was my turn to have gone off before him. But the will of the good and sovereign God has determined otherwise, and that I should tarry behind for a while in this weary wilderness. It seems I am not yet made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light, but need to be more beaten in the wilderness with the hammer of affliction, before I come to the upper temple and sanctuary. But good is the will of the Lord." His death took place on the second of June, 1754.¹

For some years after the deposition of the members of the Associate Presbytery, the proceedings of the general assembly were not of much interest. Many cases occurred of disputed appointments to parishes, and the law of patronage was more strictly enforced, now that some of its chief opponents had left the establishment. The ministers, with hardly an exception, gave their zealous support to King George during the insurrection of 1745, and received the thanks of the civil authorities, and of the Duke of Cumberland, for their exertions in behalf of the Hanoverian family and the Protestant religion. Encour-

¹ Struthers, vol. ii. p. 550-563. M'Kerrow, pp. 208-238, 511, 519-521. Gib's Display, vol. ii. p. 17-100.

aged by the favour of the government, they resolved to apply to parliament for an augmentation of their stipends, which are said to have amounted, on an average, to not more than fifty-two pounds sterling yearly. Some discussions took place on this subject in the general assembly of 1749, and the proposal was resisted by the Earl of Marchmont, ruling elder for the Presbytery of Dunse. He ridiculed the project of applying to parliament without first obtaining the consent and approbation of the landholders; declared that the English gentry would oppose it, as of very bad example in their own country; and maintained that the poverty and purity by which the Church of Scotland had hitherto been characterised were its main support.

The matter having been referred to a committee, and brought before the assembly of the following year, it was agreed to petition parliament for an augmentation. In the meantime, the landholders of almost all the Scottish counties had met, and had passed resolutions against any increase in the stipends; and their opposition was so powerful that, when the application was made to parliament, it proved entirely unsuccessful.¹

There can be no doubt that the stipends in many cases were too small, and that the proposal to augment them from the tithes in the hands of the nobility and gentry was reasonable and proper; but the government, even had it been more zealous in the cause of the ministers, could not have urged on the matter in a country situated as Scotland was at that time, without incurring dangers similar to those which attended a like attempt of King Charles the First.

The struggle in regard to patronage still went on. In 1751, the Presbytery of Linlithgow, though enjoined by the general assembly to ordain a presentee to the parish of Torphichen, refused to comply, and was censured by that body in consequence; but a motion that a more severe sentence should be inflicted, made by John Home, minister at Athelstaneford, and seconded by William Robertson, then minister at Gladmuir, was lost by a large majority. The next case which

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 702. Morren's Annals of the General Assembly, vol. i. pp. 115-130, 158-168, 190-197, 370-376. Struthers, vol. ii. 570-575. M'Kerrow, p. 249-251.

occurred was that of Inverkeithing. Here also the Presbytery of Dunfermline repeatedly declined to proceed with the settlement, notwithstanding the order of the higher ecclesiastical courts. The question came before the assembly of 1752, and was viewed by the two parties as a test of their relative strength, and of the policy which was thenceforth to be pursued by the Church. The royal commissioner, the Earl of Leven, in his opening address, shewed very plainly the views of the government. "Allow me to hope," he said, "that, as it is our happiness to have regular meetings of our national assembly countenanced by our gracious sovereign, you will be careful to support its dignity and authority, and not destroy with your own hands our most valuable constitution, secured by law, so dear to your forefathers, so excellent in itself, and which your enemies have so often in vain attempted to wrest from you. The main intention of your meeting is frustrated, if your judgments and decisions are not held to be final; if inferior courts continue to assume that liberty they have taken upon themselves in too many instances of disputing and disobeying the decisions of their superiors." It was agreed, by a majority of one hundred and two to fifty-six, to order the presbytery to proceed immediately with the admission of the presentee, and to report their having done so at the bar of the assembly. The admission did not take place, in consequence of the requisite quorum refusing to concur. Six members of the presbytery gave in a representation to the assembly, in which they declared that they could not conscientiously obey the injunction, because the people continued firmly opposed to the presentee, and because they held it to be a principle of their Church that no minister should be intruded into any parish contrary to the wishes of the congregation. The moderator warned the six brethren of the danger they were incurring; but they persisted in their resolution. It was in consequence agreed, by a majority of ninety three to sixty five, that one of the six should be deposed; and the person selected was Thomas Gillespie, minister at Carnock. When the sentence of deposition was pronounced, Gillespie said, "Moderator, I desire to receive this sentence of the general assembly of the Church of Scotland, pronounced against me, with real concern, and awful impressions of the divine conduct in it; but I rejoice

that to me it is given, in behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for his sake.”

Gillespie was a meek and pious man, and much beloved by his congregation. His conduct immediately after his deposition is thus described :—“To this sentence he submitted in its full extent, readily relinquishing all the temporal emoluments arising from the legal establishment. On the Lord’s-day following, he would not so much as preach in the church of Carnock, (as some of the deposed Seceders had continued to do in their churches,) nor allow the bell to be rung, but repaired to the open fields, and having chosen for his text the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the ninth chapter, and sixteenth verse, ‘For necessity is laid upon me, yea woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel,’ he told his hearers that, though the assembly had deposed him from being a minister of the established Church for not doing what he believed it was sinful for him to do, yet he hoped, through grace, no public disputes should be his theme, but Jesus Christ and Him crucified : he desired at all seasons to have it in his eye ‘that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God ;’ and then went on to lay before them the great and fundamental truths of the everlasting Gospel, without one reflection on all that had passed.”

Some attempts were made, but without success, to obtain a recall of Gillespie’s sentence. He continued to officiate to his own people, and, in the year 1761, joined with two other ministers, one of whom was Thomas Boston, son of Boston of Ettrick, in forming a distinct communion, under the name of The Presbytery of Relief. This body, in 1773, formed itself into a synod, consisting of two presbyteries. Its members retained a strong feeling of attachment to the established Church, professing to look upon themselves rather as auxiliary to it, than as arrayed in opposition against it.¹

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 707-711. Morren’s Annals of the General Assembly, vol. i. pp. 198-212, 222-280. Struthers, vol. ii. p. 575-604. M’Kerrow, pp. 244-249. Autobiography of Dr. Carlyle, pp. 245-248, 271, 279-284. Struthers’s History of the Rise of the Relief Church, pp. 213-226, 284-287. Mr. Morren, in the preface to the first volume of his Annals of the General Assembly (p. iv.), directs attention to the change of policy in the proceedings of the assemblies of 1751 and 1752. “Mr. Dugald Stewart,” he says, “ascribes this abrupt transition from leniency to severity to the eloquence of Robertson ; but allowing all due

The Presbyterian Church, established at the Revolution, had never acquired an effectual hold over the higher classes of the country. Such of these classes as were zealous for religion adhered for the most part to Episcopacy; while those who conformed to the establishment did so mainly because it was the Church recognised by law, and because adherence to a proscribed communion involved political disabilities. The Associate Synod included among its members a large proportion of the lower ranks, especially in those districts where Presbyterianism was formerly strongest. Opinions were now propagated among the middle classes, and among the educated portion of the nation, which threatened, not only to weaken the authority of the establishment, but to undermine all principles of religious belief. The most dangerous writer of this school was David Hume; but various authors disseminated opinions in theology and in philosophy, which partook more or less of the sceptical tendency of the principles maintained by the opponents of revelation. Among these authors was Henry Home, who, in the year 1752, was appointed a senator of the College of Justice, and was thenceforth known by his judicial title of Lord Kames.

The ministers of the established Church were aware of the dangers to which religion was exposed from such attacks, and were generally anxious to do what they could to repel them. The popular party took the lead in this respect; and their zeal was not lessened by the circumstance that, among the personal friends and associates of Hume, were several ministers who stood high in the confidence of the moderate party. In the year 1751, Henry Home published his "Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion." This work was attacked, and the author denounced under the name of Sopho, by a preacher named George Anderson, in his "Estimate of the profit and loss of Religion," which appeared in 1753. In 1755, a short time before the meeting of the

weight to that and other circumstances, they are not, to my mind, sufficient to account for the very great majority by which the new measures were supported. But let the reader mark the fact, that the augmentation scheme was defeated in parliament immediately after the assembly of 1751, and let him peruse the paper that was then circulated, and which we have given in the foot-note to p. 196, and he may possibly there find some explanation of the mystery."

general assembly, an anonymous pamphlet was published, in which the author directed the special attention of the members to the writings both of Lord Kames and of Hume. The latter author was named, but the former was spoken of, as in Anderson's work, under the designation of Sopho, probably because it was thought to be dangerous or indecorous to make an open attack on one holding the office of a judge.

When the general assembly met, the subject was brought under its notice, and the following act was unanimously agreed to:—"The general assembly, being filled with the deepest concern on account of the prevalence of infidelity and immorality, the principles whereof have been, to the disgrace of our age and nation, so openly avowed in several books published of late in this country, and which are but too well-known among us, do therefore judge it proper and necessary for them, at this time, to express the utmost abhorrence of these impious and infidel principles, which are subversive of all religion, natural and revealed, and have such pernicious influence on life and morals. And they do earnestly recommend it to all the ministers of this Church, to exercise the vigilance, and to exert the zeal which becomes their character, to preserve those under their charge from the contagion of these abominable tenets, and to stir up in them a solicitous concern to guard against them, and against the influence of those who are infected with them."

No direct notice was taken of Lord Kames by the assembly, but, in the following year, attention was formally drawn to the writings of Hume. A proposal was made in the committee of overtures to enquire into his works, and to call their author before the next assembly. This motion was strongly opposed on various grounds, but chiefly as being inexpedient. A debate took place which lasted for two days, and the following resolution was moved by the opponents of the overture—"That, though all the members have a just abhorrence of any principles tending to infidelity, or to the prejudice of our holy religion, yet, on account of certain circumstances in this case, they drop the overture, because it would not, in their judgment, serve the purpose of edification." This resolution was agreed to by a majority of fifty to seventeen.¹

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 721. Morren's Annals of the General Assembly, vol. VOL. IV.]

In December, 1756, the tragedy of Douglas was performed in the theatre at Edinburgh; the author, John Home, Alexander Carlyle, minister at Inveresk, and some other ministers, being present. The Presbytery of Edinburgh issued soon afterwards an admonition against stage-plays, and suspended one of their number, who, on a single occasion, had been present in the theatre. They also addressed a letter to other presbyteries whose members had attended the representation of Home's tragedy. In most of those presbyteries, the offending ministers were rebuked. Home himself escaped censure by resigning his benefice. In the Presbytery of Dalkeith, to which Inveresk belonged, Carlyle expressed his regret for having given offence, and declared his intention of abstaining from similar conduct in future; but he objected to the competency of the formal proceedings which had been raised against him, stating that the affair was one which called rather for private admonition. The presbytery referred the whole matter to the Synod of Lothian. That synod found, by a small majority, that private censure, or brotherly conference and admonition, was the proper mode of proceeding, but expressed its strong displeasure with Carlyle's conduct. The presbytery appealed to the general assembly, and, that court having met in May, 1757, the sentence of the synod was affirmed by a large majority. The assembly also agreed to the following overture:—"The general assembly, considering how much the success of the Gospel depends on the regular and inoffensive behaviour of the ministers of this Church, do earnestly recommend to the several presbyteries, to take such wise and effectual measures as may promote the spirit of our holy religion, and preserve the purity and decorum of the ministerial character; and that they take care that none of the ministers of this Church do, upon any occasion, attend the theatre." Another overture, which proposed to include all members of the Church and not ministers only, was laid aside.¹

ii. pp. 54-61, 86-92. Lord Woodhouselee's *Life of Lord Kames*, vol. i. p. 141-144. Burton's *Life of Hume*, vol. i. p. 425-430.

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 729. Morren's *Annals of the General Assembly*, vol. ii. p. 112-130. Autobiography of Dr. Carlyle, p. 310-325. Dr. Carlyle states that the declaratory act of the assembly, forbidding ministers to attend the theatre, was totally neglected—at least by those who were not resident in Edinburgh and the neighbourhood. He adds, "It is remarkable that, in the year 1784, when

There were no further important proceedings in the general assembly during the remaining years of the reign of George the Second. At the date of that sovereign's decease, the established Church included the whole nation, except the adherents of Episcopacy, now much reduced in number, the still smaller body of Roman Catholics, the Seceders, and the few who had joined the Wesleyan Society. No formal change in doctrine, worship, or government, had taken place since the Revolution. The Presbyterian discipline was strictly maintained; the Westminster Confession was the standard of belief; and the Directory was the authorized guide in public worship. Some customs, of little importance, differing from the old usages, had been adopted, such as the sanction of the university degree of Doctor of Divinity. But, besides these, the practice differed in several respects, both in connection with the forms of worship, and with the administration of the sacraments, from that which had prevailed before the Revolution. Some of the new practices were opposed to the established formularies; but most of them were merely unauthorized additions to the system of former times.

Divine service was in general celebrated only on the Sabbath day, as Sunday was now styled, and on days connected with the administration of the communion, or other special days of fasting or thanksgiving. It consisted in most cases of several long prayers said by the minister; of metrical psalms from a revised version by Francis Rous, in which the people joined; and of a sermon, which was regarded as the most important of the whole. The Lord's Prayer, the use of which had been recommended in the Directory, was seldom said, and it was known that the most rigid Presbyterians would look with suspicion on any one who adopted it. The people stood during prayer, and sat while the Psalms were sung. A regular course of reading from the Holy Scriptures

the great actress Mrs. Siddons first appeared in Edinburgh, during the sitting of the general assembly, that court was obliged to fix all its important business for the alternate days when she did not act, as all the younger members, clergy as well as laity, took their station in the theatre on those days by three in the afternoon." Many years after his resignation John Home sat repeatedly in the general assembly as an elder; he then held the office of Lord Conservator of Scottish Privileges at Campvere, to which he had been appointed by his friend and patron, the Earl of Bute.

had been enjoined by the Directory, but was generally neglected: even the Psalter, except in a metrical version, and the Gospels, were seldom heard by any Presbyterian congregation in Scotland. An attempt had been made to improve the public worship by the introduction of a better style of vocal music, but this innovation, as it was called, was violently opposed. By many it was viewed with as much antipathy as the use of a liturgy, and the most unseemly proceedings frequently took place in consequence during the time of divine service.

In the celebration of Baptism, a great change had gradually been introduced, and was becoming more and more common. The prohibition of Private Baptism was disregarded, and, in many cases, children were baptized in their parents' houses. This was no doubt partly owing to the deep-seated persuasion of the necessity of Baptism, wherever it could be had, which Calvinism had never been able entirely to overcome; but it was still more a concession to laxity, and to the fear of alienating the higher classes from the establishment. In connection with the other sacrament, abuses of a different description had become very prevalent. In some parishes, the Lord's Supper was not administered, except at very long intervals; and it was seldom oftener than once a-year. Another corruption was prevalent among the ministers of the popular party, and in those districts where the old Covenanting feeling was strongest. When the sacrament was to be administered in a parish, the incumbent was assisted by a considerable number of other ministers, and sermons were preached in the open air, at which multitudes of people assembled, very few of whom received the communion. "The occasion," as such a celebration was called, was really a great popular festival, and, like some similar abuses in the Middle Ages, was too often attended with consequences prejudicial to the morals of the persons who were present.

Those who had been taught from childhood to dislike anything approaching to liturgical services, saw nothing erroneous or defective in this system of worship; but even for them, apart from the sermon, it had few attractions. It was the congregational discipline of the establishment, and of the communities which had separated from it, the education given

in the parochial schools, and the zeal and untiring pastoral devotion of the ministers, that were chiefly instrumental in maintaining the strict morality which distinguished the great body of the Scottish people at this time.

General correctness, and even austerity of conduct, were the characteristics of all who made any profession of religion. Many individuals, however, were marked by higher graces. The narrow theology, and the mistaken ecclesiastical principles, of the two Erskines, are obvious to all who do not share their peculiar belief; but their sincerity, integrity, and self-denying virtues, deserve the highest commendation. Of a like character, though marred by similar defects, was the piety of Thomas Boston, whose writings exercised a deep influence over the religious belief and feelings of his countrymen. The Presbyterian system possessed the strongest hold among the middle and lower classes of the people, but it moulded also the character of some of the best and most eminent of the higher ranks. Few finer examples of excellence and zeal are to be found than in the life of John Erskine of Carnock, a son of the house of Cardross, the leader in his day of the strict party among the gentry, and the resolute opponent of the Patronage Act, and of all measures which seemed to interfere with the purity and efficiency of the Church established at the Revolution. It is almost needless to refer to a name so well-known as that of Colonel Gardiner. Converted in middle life from a course of profligacy, his character exhibited from that time every quality which could adorn the Christian soldier. Of a still higher type was Lord President Forbes. Sincerely attached to the established religion, but without bigotry or fanaticism, and unstained by the vices so common at that time among others of his rank and station, he pursued a consistent course of rectitude and worth. His memory continues to be revered by his countrymen; and few indeed of those whose names are most zealously cherished by the Scottish people are equally deserving of such regard and affection.¹

¹ Dr. Carlyle, in his *Autobiography* (p. 16-19), denies the truth of Doddridge's well-known account of the conversion of Colonel Gardiner. He may be correct as to this; but his other remarks on Gardiner must be received with caution. To a shrewd worldly person like Carlyle, the character of such a man as Gardiner was almost unintelligible.

CHAPTER LXXXII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING GEORGE II. IN OCTOBER, 1760, TO THE REPEAL
OF THE PENAL LAWS IN JUNE, 1792.

Accession of George the Third—Favourable change in the position of the Church—Bishop Falconer appointed Primus—A new edition of the Communion Office—The English Nonjurors—Bishop Kildgour appointed Primus—Dr. Seabury elected Bishop by the clergy of Connecticut—He applies to the Scottish Bishops for consecration—He is consecrated at Aberdeen—Concordate between the Scottish Bishops and Dr. Seabury—Address of the clergy of Connecticut to their Bishop—Bishop Skinner appointed Primus—Character of Bishop Petrie—Death of Prince Charles—The Bishops and Clergy acknowledge King George—Attempt to obtain a repeal of the penal laws—It is at first unsuccessful—Convention of the clergy and laity at Laurencekirk—The penal laws are repealed—Restrictions imposed on the Scottish clergy.

AFTER the accession of King George the Third, a favourable change gradually took place in the condition of the Episcopal Church. The ecclesiastical and political principles of the young sovereign were different from those of his two immediate predecessors; and he had no wish to enforce the rigour of the laws against a communion, whose only crimes were its attachment to Episcopacy, and an exaggerated opinion of the claims of hereditary right. The clergy, aware that active persecution was no longer to be dreaded, began to discharge their pastoral duties more openly; and their congregations ventured, though in the humblest and quietest manner, to erect buildings for the celebration of their proscribed worship. While it became apparent that the new Hanoverian sovereign looked with kindness on all classes of his subjects, the prospect of restoring the house of Stewart was seen to be utterly hope-

less ; and many, both of the clergy and of the laity, became convinced of the lawfulness of submitting to the prince in possession of the throne. In outward appearance, however, matters remained as before. No formal relaxation of the penal laws took place, and the Chevalier was still acknowledged by the bishops and clergy as their rightful king.

Bishop White died on the sixteenth of August, 1761. He was succeeded in the office of Primus by Bishop Falconer, and, in the superintendence of the district of Fife, by his coadjutor, Bishop Edgar. On the feast of the Nativity of S. John the Baptist, 1762, being the same day on which the new Primus was chosen and Bishop Edgar collated to the district of Fife, Robert Forbes, a presbyter at Leith, who had been elected bishop by the clergy of Ross and Caithness, was consecrated at Forfar by the Primus, and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Aberdeen. Bishop Edgar died on the twenty-first of August, 1765. No one was appointed to succeed him in the district of Fife.¹

In the year 1764, a new edition of the Communion Office was published under the superintendence of the Primus. The text and arrangement corresponded in most points with the edition of 1743, and still more closely with an edition which had been printed in 1755. The office of 1764 was reprinted in the following year under the superintendence of Bishop Forbes ; and it was soon recognized in practice as the established use of the Scottish Church.²

The chief differences between the Communion Office in King Charles's Book and the office of 1764 were the following :—After the sermon, and between the offertory sentences and the offering up of the Bread and Wine on the Holy Table, instead of the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, there was inserted a prayer of thanksgiving by the presbyter, taken from King David's prayer in the twenty-ninth

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 19, 20. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 683. Keith's Catalogue, pp. 549, 550. Stephen, vol. iv. pp. 373, 377. The date of Bishop Edgar's decease is mentioned in the inscription on his tomb-stone in the burying ground of the abbey church of Arbroath, quoted in Mr. Jervise's *Land of the Lindsays*, p. 271.

² Compare Skinner, vol. ii. pp. 681, 682 ; Mr. Cheyne's *Vindication of the Scottish Communion Office*, p. 21-25 ; and Mr. Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 269, 270.

chapter of the First Book of Chronicles, and forming part of one of the offertory sentences in the office of 1637. The *Sursum Corda*, the proper prefaces, and the Trisagion, succeeded. The prayer of Consecration came next, consisting of the same parts as that in King Charles's Book, but in a different order, the words of institution immediately preceding the Oblation, and the Invocation being last of all. The prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church followed, and, in the rubric, the words "militant here in earth" were omitted. The Lord's Prayer was next inserted; and it was succeeded by an invitation to the communicants, the General Confession, and the Absolution. After the words of our Saviour, of St. Paul, and of St. John, came the collect of humble access, which was immediately followed by the administration of the Communion: the benediction to the communicants being the same in both offices. The service concluded with an exhortation to the duty of thanksgiving, the collect of thanksgiving, the Gloria in Excelsis, and the Blessing; the last three as in the older office.

The Chevalier died in January, 1766. The cause of Jacobitism was now little more than a name, and the event had no influence on the political or ecclesiastical affairs of Britain.

For several years nothing of any importance took place in the history of the Church, with the exception of appointments to the vacant sees and episcopal consecrations. Bishop Gerard died on the seventh of October, 1767. The clergy of Aberdeen, or at least a majority of them, elected the Bishop of Ross; but the Episcopal College, on account of some irregularities in the election, and of the necessity for a resident bishop in a diocese so important, refused to ratify the choice. The clergy therefore proceeded to a new election, and chose Robert Kilgour, a presbyter at Peterhead. The prelate so elected was consecrated at Cupar in Fife, on St. Matthew's day, 1768, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Brechin and Dunkeld. The see of Dunblane, which had remained vacant since the resignation of Bishop White, was filled by the appointment of Charles Rose, a presbyter at Doune, who was consecrated at Forfar, on St. Bartholomew's day, 1774, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Brechin and Ross. In 1776, Arthur Petrie, a presbyter at Folla, in the

diocese of Aberdeen, was appointed coadjutor to the Primus in the see of Murray, and was consecrated at Dundee, on the twenty-seventh of June, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Brechin, Aberdeen, and Dunblane. Bishop Alexander died on the twenty-fourth of April, 1776. Soon after his decease, the clergy of Dunkeld asked and obtained a mandate to elect a successor in the see. They made choice of the Bishop of Dunblane, and his appointment was confirmed by the Episcopal College. Bishop Forbes died on the eighteenth of November, 1775, and Bishop Rait on the thirteenth of January, 1777. The dioceses under the charge of the former prelate were committed to the care of Bishop Petrie. The manner of his nomination deserves to be noticed. The only surviving presbyter in the two northern dioceses was Allan Cameron, at Arpafellie; and, on a letter being presented from him and several of the laity requesting the appointment of Bishop Petrie, that bishop was collated by the Episcopal College to the superintendence of Ross and Caithness. The clergy of Brechin elected George Innes, a presbyter at Aberdeen, who was consecrated at Alloa, on the thirteenth of August, 1778, by the Primus, and Bishops Rose and Petrie.¹

On the fifth of March, 1777, Robert Gordon, one of the English Nonjuring bishops, and the last surviving prelate of that portion of the Nonjuring body with which the Scottish bishops were in communion, wrote the following letter, addressed to "the right reverend the Primus, and his col-

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 21-26. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 683. Keith's Catalogue, p. 540. Lawson, p. 321. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 57. Scots Magazine, vol. xxxvii. p. 638. Dr. Walker, Bishop of Edinburgh, has preserved an illustration of the care of Bishop Alexander in catechizing the young members of his flock—"Many years ago," he says, I heard the late venerable Dr. Gaskin relate the following fact:—"When I first came to this parish (Stoke-Newington), I remarked a plain man who was never absent from church, who communicated regularly every month, and conducted himself with great appearance of devotion. I was in consequence desirous to become acquainted with him. He was a gardener from Scotland. He was so perfectly acquainted with everything connected with our communion, so well instructed in every principle, and so rationally pious, as excited my extreme surprise when he told me he came from Scotland, a Presbyterian country; for of the Episcopal Church there I was almost entirely ignorant. I expressed my surprise, when he replied, with a strong expression of feeling, 'Ah! Sir, I was well catechized in all that by Bishop Alexander at Alloa.'" (Charge to the clergy of Edinburgh and Glasgow, p. 47.)

leagues, the Bishops of the Church of Scotland :”—“ Considering the precarious and uncertain tenure of man’s life, and, in particular, mine own infirmities in an advanced age, which the royal Psalmist tells us is but labour and sorrow, I cannot help being full of solicitude and anxiety to provide for the spiritual comfort and security of the poor orphans of the anti-Revolution Church of England, whom I shall leave behind me ; it is therefore my earnest desire and request to your paternities, that you would vouchsafe to take the poor minished remnant under the wings of your paternal protection, receiving them into full communion as sound members of the Catholic Church, by such synodical act as to your paternities, in your wisdom, shall seem meet ; wherein, right reverend brethren, you will afford the highest satisfaction and comfort to your affectionate brother, and devoted servant in Christ.”

The Scottish prelates returned an answer, expressing their readiness to comply with Bishop Gordon’s request. They said :—“ We hereby declare upon every proper occasion our willingness to take under our care and tuition, and to receive into full communion with us, in all the holy offices of Christian communion and fellowship, as members of Christ’s mystical body, all those who are in full communion with you ; and we promise that they shall be entitled to the same privileges in the participation of the Holy Mysteries, and all other means of grace, dispensed by the bishops and ministers of our Church, equally with those under our pastoral care in this our ancient kingdom.”¹

In the year 1776, the vacancy of the see of Edinburgh, which had lasted nearly forty years, came to an end. The calamities in which all were involved at length brought the Episcopal College and the clergy of the capital to one mind ; and the Primus, who had long resided in Edinburgh, was elected bishop on the twenty-fifth of October. On his appointment he resigned the diocese of Murray, to which Bishop Petrie was elected. In 1782, Bishop Falconer resigned the primacy, on account of his infirm health, and, on the twenty-fifth of September, the Bishop of Aberdeen was appointed his successor in that office. On the same day, John Skinner, a presbyter at Aberdeen, son of John Skinner, incumbent of

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 27-30.

Longside, was consecrated as coadjutor to the Primus in the see of Aberdeen, at Luthermuir, a secluded chapel not far from Laurencekirk. The consecrating prelates were the Primus, and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Murray. Bishop Innes died on the eighteenth of May, 1781, and the see of Brechin remained vacant for several years. Bishop Falconer died on the fifteenth of June, 1784, being then in the seventy-seventh year of his age; and the see of Edinburgh also remained vacant for some time.¹

At the date of Bishop Falconer's decease, there were only four prelates in the Scottish Church, Bishop Kilgour, the Primus, Bishop Rose of Dunkeld and Dunblane, Bishop Petrie of Murray and Ross, and Bishop Skinner, coadjutor of Aberdeen. The clergy were about forty in number. There are no means of ascertaining the numbers of the laity, but they were not probably a twentieth part of the Scottish nation. The sufferings of forty years had been endured without complaint or remonstrance; the government had almost forgotten the existence of a body which it continued to proscribe; and many even of the better informed of the English clergy were not aware that an independent hierarchy still existed in Scotland. At this period of outward depression, the Scottish bishops took part in an act, which once more directed attention to the communion over which they presided.²

In 1783, the war between Great Britain and her revolted colonies in America terminated with the acknowledgment of the independence of the United States. While the colonies were still a part of the empire, the British government refused to allow bishops to be consecrated for the clergy and laity in America professing the religion which was established by law in England. On the restoration of peace, the American citizens who belonged to what was formerly styled the English Church were left in a state of ecclesiastical anarchy. Both those who recognised the apostolical episcopate as a divinely

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 25, 31, 32. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 683. Keith's Catalogue, p. 545. Scots Magazine, vol. xlv. p. 335. In regard to the date of Bishop Kilgour's appointment to the primacy, see Skinner, vol. ii. p. 697, and Stephen, vol. iv. p. 392.

² The numbers of the clergy may be ascertained with sufficient accuracy from the lists published after the repeal of the penal laws, making allowance for a slight increase during the intervening period.

appointed institution, without which a Church could hardly be said to exist, and those who looked upon it merely as a lawful form of government, essential to the well-being of their own religious body, were convinced that, unless they could obtain duly consecrated bishops, they would soon be lost among the sects by which they were surrounded. They naturally looked to their mother Church for assistance; but, though England, taught by adversity, was now disposed to act a better part, the laws forbade any one to be consecrated who did not acknowledge the royal supremacy, and apprehensions were also entertained that the consecration of bishops for America would be viewed with jealousy and dislike by the new republic.

Foremost among the American clergy who sought the gift of the episcopate were those of Connecticut. They made choice of Dr. Samuel Seabury, one of their own number, as a fit person for the episcopal office. This clergyman, a sufferer for his loyalty during the war, came over to England with the requisite testimonials. He was kindly received by the English prelates, but the difficulties referred to made them slow in giving a decided answer to his application. Seabury, weary of delay, and aware that an orthodox and apostolical communion remained in Scotland, was led to make his wishes known to the bishops of that country.

The Scottish prelates were prepared in some degree for the consideration of such a request, by a correspondence which had taken place between Dr. Berkeley, a prebendary of Canterbury, son of the good Bishop of Cloyne, and Bishop Skinner. Berkeley had exhorted the Scottish bishops to embrace the first opportunity of introducing a Protestant episcopate into America, declaring his belief that the king, whom he spoke of as a mild monarch who loved the Church as much as his grandfather hated it, several of his counsellors, and almost all the English bishops, would look on such an act with satisfaction. The Scottish prelates, after some hesitation, assented to the propriety of the course recommended. The Primus expressed his belief that the motion was from the Holy Spirit. "The very prospect," wrote another of them, probably Bishop Petrie, "rejoices me greatly; and considering the great depositum committed to us, I do not see how we can account to our great Lord and Master, if we neglect such an opportunity of promoting his truth and enlarging the borders of his Church."

On the thirty-first of August, 1784, Dr. Seabury made a formal application to the Scottish bishops. After explaining his own position and that of the Church of Connecticut, and the failure of his efforts in England, he said : " On this ground it is that I apply to the good bishops in Scotland, and I hope I shall not apply in vain. If they consent to impart the episcopal succession to the Church of Connecticut, they will, I think, do a good work, and the blessing of thousands will attend them. And perhaps for this cause, among others, God's providence has supported them, and continued their succession under various and great difficulties, that a free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical episcopacy may from them pass into the western world." The bishops having given a favourable answer, Seabury repaired to Scotland, and, on Sunday the fourteenth of November, was consecrated at Aberdeen by the Primus, the Bishop of Murray and Ross, and the Bishop-coadjutor of Aberdeen.

On the fifteenth of November, the Scottish bishops and the newly consecrated prelate, met in synod, and agreed to certain articles, which were intended, as the document bore, " to serve as a concordate or bond of union between the Catholic remainder of the ancient Church of Scotland and the now rising Church in Connecticut." The following were the articles subscribed by the contracting parties :—

" I. They agree in thankfully receiving, and humbly and heartily embracing the whole doctrines of the Gospel, as revealed and set forth in the Holy Scriptures; and it is their earnest and united desire to maintain the analogy of the common faith once delivered to the saints, and happily preserved in the Church of Christ, through his divine power and protection, who promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against it.

" II. They agree in believing this Church to be the mystical body of Christ, of which He alone is the Head and Supreme Governor; and that under Him the chief ministers or managers of the affairs of this spiritual society are those called bishops, whose exercise of their sacred office being independent of all lay powers, it follows, of consequence, that their spiritual authority and jurisdiction cannot be affected by any lay deprivation.

“ III. They agree in declaring that the Episcopal Church in Connecticut is to be in full communion with the Episcopal Church in Scotland, it being their sincere resolution to put matters on such a footing as that the members of both Churches may with freedom and safety communicate with either, when their occasions call them from the one country to the other ; only taking care, when in Scotland, not to hold communion in sacred offices with those persons who, under the pretence of ordination by an English or Irish bishop, do, or shall, take upon them to officiate as clergymen in any part of the national Church of Scotland, and whom the Scottish bishops cannot help looking upon as schismatical intruders, designed only to answer worldly purposes, and uncommissioned disturbers of the poor remains of that once flourishing Church, which both their predecessors and they have, under many difficulties, laboured to preserve pure and uncorrupted to future ages.

“ IV. With a view to this salutary purpose, mentioned in the preceding article, they agree in desiring that there may be as near a conformity in worship and discipline established between the two Churches, as is consistent with the different circumstances and customs of nations ; and, in order to avoid any bad effects that might otherwise arise from political differences, they hereby express their earnest wish and firm intention to observe such prudent generality in the public prayers with respect to these points, as shall appear most agreeable to apostolic rules, and the practice of the primitive Church.

“ V. As the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, or the administration of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, is the principal bond of union among Christians, as well as the most solemn act of worship in the Christian Church, the bishops aforesaid agree in desiring that there may be as little variance here as possible ; and, though the Scottish bishops are very far from prescribing to their brethren in this matter, they cannot help ardently wishing that Bishop Seabury would endeavour all he can, consistently with peace and prudence, to make the celebration of this venerable mystery conformable to the most primitive doctrine and practice in that respect, which is the pattern the Church of Scotland has copied after in her Communion Office, and which it has been the wish of some of

the most eminent divines of the Church of England that she also had more closely followed, than she seems to have done since she gave up her first Reformed Liturgy, used in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, between which, and the form used in the Church of Scotland, there is no difference in any point which the primitive Church reckoned essential to the right ministration of the Holy Eucharist. In this capital article, therefore, the Eucharistic Service, in which the Scottish bishops so earnestly wish for as much unity as possible, Bishop Seabury also agrees to take a serious view of the Communion Office recommended by them, and, if found agreeable to the genuine standards of antiquity, to give his sanction to it, and by gentle methods of argument and persuasion to endeavour, as they have done, to introduce it by degrees into practice, without the compulsion of authority on the one side, or the prejudice of former custom on the other.

“VI. It is also hereby agreed and resolved upon, for the better answering the purposes of this concordate, that a brotherly fellowship be henceforth maintained between the Episcopal Churches in Scotland and Connecticut, and such a mutual intercourse of ecclesiastical correspondence carried on, when opportunity offers, or necessity requires, as may tend to the support and edification of both Churches.

“VII. The bishops aforesaid do hereby jointly declare, in the most solemn manner, that in the whole of this transaction they have nothing else in view but the glory of God, and the good of his Church; and, being thus pure and upright in their intentions, they cannot but hope that all whom it may concern will put the most fair and candid construction on their conduct, and take no offence at their feeble but sincere endeavours to promote what they believe to be the cause of truth and of the common salvation.”

At the synod, a letter was also drawn up and addressed by the Scottish bishops to the clergy of Connecticut.

Bishop Seabury returned to his own land, full of gratitude and zeal. The clergy of Connecticut met their bishop at Middleton, on the third of August, 1785, and presented to him the following address:—“We, who have hereunto subscribed our names, in behalf of ourselves, and other presbyters of the Episcopal Church, embrace with pleasure this early oppor-

tunity of congratulating you on your safe return to your native country, and on the accomplishment of that arduous enterprize in which at our desire you engaged. Devoutly do we adore and reverently thank the great Head of the Church, that He has been pleased to preserve you through a long and dangerous voyage; that He has crowned your endeavours with success, and now at last permits us to enjoy, under you, the long and ardently desired blessing of a pure, valid, and free episcopacy—a blessing which we receive as the precious gift of God Himself—and humbly hope that the work He has so auspiciously begun He will confirm and prosper, and make it a real benefit to our Church, not only in this state, but in the American states in general, by uniting them in doctrine, discipline, and worship, by supporting the cause of Christianity against all its opposers, and by promoting piety, concord, and mutual affection, among all denominations of Christians.

“Whatever can be done by us for the advancement of so good a work shall be done with united attention, and the exertion of our best abilities; and, as you are now by our voluntary and united suffrages, signified to you first at New York in April, 1783, by the Rev. Mr. Jarvis, and now ratified and confirmed in this present convention, elected Bishop of that branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church to which we belong, we, in the presence of Almighty God, declare to the world, that we do unanimously and voluntarily accept, receive, and recognize you to be our bishop, supreme in the government of the Church, and in the administration of all ecclesiastical offices. And we do solemnly engage to render you all that respect, duty, and submission, which we believe to belong and are due to your high office, and which we understand were given by the presbyters to their bishops in the primitive Church, while, in her native purity, she was unconnected with, and uncontrolled by, any secular power.

“The experience of many years had long ago convinced the whole body of the clergy, and many of the lay members of our communion, of the necessity there was of having a resident bishop among us. Fully and publicly was our cause pleaded and supported by such arguments as must have carried conviction to the minds of all candid and liberal men. They were, however, for reasons which we are unable to assign,

neglected by our superiors in England. Some of these arguments were drawn from our being members of the national Church, and subjects of the British government. These lost their force upon the separation of this country from Great Britain by the late peace. Our case became thereby more desperate, and our spiritual necessities were much increased. Filial affection still induced us to place confidence in our parent Church and country, whose liberality and benevolence we had long experienced, and do most gratefully acknowledge. To this Church was our immediate application directed, earnestly requesting a bishop to collect, govern, and continue our scattered, wandering, and sinking Church: and great was, and still continues to be, our surprise, that a request so reasonable in itself, so congruous to the nature and government of that Church, and begging for an officer so absolutely necessary in the Church of Christ as they and we believe a bishop to be, should be refused. We hope that the successors of the Apostles in the Church of England have sufficient reasons to justify themselves to the world and to God. We, however, know of none such, nor can our imagination frame any.

“But, blessed be God, another door was opened for you. In the mysterious economy of his providence, He had preserved the remains of the old Episcopal Church of Scotland under all the malice and persecutions of its enemies. In the school of adversity, its pious and venerable bishops had learned to renounce the pomps and grandeur of the world, and were ready to do the work of their heavenly Father. As outcasts they pitied us; as faithful holders of the apostolical commission, what they had freely received they freely gave. From them we have received a free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical episcopacy; are thereby made complete in all our parts; and have a right to be considered as a living, and we hope, through God’s grace, shall be a vigorous branch, of the Catholic Church.

“To these venerable fathers our sincerest thanks are due, and they have them most fervidly. May the Almighty be their rewarder, regard them in mercy, support them under the persecutions of their enemies, and turn the hearts of their persecutors, and make their simplicity and godly sincerity known unto all men! And wherever the American Episcopal Church

shall be mentioned in the world, may this good deed which they have done for us be spoken of for a memorial of them !”

Bishop Seabury said in his reply :—“ The surprise you express at the rejection of your application in England is natural. But, where the ecclesiastical and civil constitutions are so closely woven together as they are in that country, the first characters in the Church for station and merit may find their good dispositions rendered ineffectual by the intervention of the civil authority. And whether it is better to submit quietly to this state of things in England, or to risk that confusion which would probably ensue should an amendment be attempted, demands serious consideration. The sentiments you entertain of the venerable bishops in Scotland are highly pleasing to me. Their conduct through the whole business was candid, friendly, and Christian ; appearing to me to arise from a just sense of duty, and to be founded in, and conducted by, the true principles of the primitive apostolical Church. And I hope you will join with me in manifestations of gratitude to them, by always keeping up the most intimate communion with them and their suffering Church.”

At a subsequent meeting of the Connecticut clergy at New-haven, in the month of September, an answer to the letter of the Scottish bishops was agreed to.

A correspondence was kept up between Bishop Seabury and Bishop Skinner ; and, at one time, the former thought of applying to the Scottish prelates to assist in consecrating another bishop for America, in order the better to oppose the latitudinarian principles which were prevalent among the Episcopalians of the southern states. There was happily no necessity for such a measure. The Bishop of Connecticut, and the prelates who were consecrated at Lambeth in 1787, entered into full communion with each other. The former waived his objections to the admission of the laity into ecclesiastical synods ; and the latter adopted various suggestions of Seabury in regard to their liturgical services, and particularly their Eucharistic Office, which was framed on the model of that used by the Scottish Church.¹

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 33-46. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 683-687. Skinner's Annals, p. 42-73. Stephen, vol. iv. p. 397-402. Bishop Wilberforce's History of the American Church, p. 195-230. See also the Scot-

In October, 1786, Bishop Kilgour resigned the see of Aberdeen, of which his coadjutor was appointed sole bishop. Two years afterwards he also resigned the primacy, and Bishop Skinner was elected to the vacant office in December, 1788. Bishop Kilgour died on the twenty-second of March, 1790.¹

In the autumn of 1786, Bishop Rose resigned the see of Dunkeld, but still retained that of Dunblane. A mandate for the election of a bishop was issued to the clergy of Dunkeld, and they unanimously elected Dr. William Abernethy Drummond, a presbyter in Edinburgh. As Dr. Drummond declined to accept, the clergy chose James Lyall, one of their own number; and, on his also declining, they made choice of George Gleig, a presbyter at Pittenweem. Mr. Gleig was willing to accept; but, on objections to his promotion being made by Bishop Skinner for reasons which are not sufficiently explained, he resigned the appointment. The see in consequence remained vacant.

On the seventh of March, 1787, Andrew Macfarlane, a presbyter in Inverness, was consecrated at Peterhead, as coadjutor

tish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. i. p. 215-217, and the Address of the clergy of Connecticut to their bishop, with his Answer, published at Edinburgh in 1786. The place of Dr. Seabury's consecration was the upper room of a house in Long-acre, Aberdeen, which, according to the exigencies of that time, was used partly as a chapel, partly as the residence of Bishop Skinner, and on the site of which a chapel, now occupied by the Wesleyans, was built in 1795. The names of various eminent persons are mentioned by different authors, in connection with the first suggestion made to Seabury that he should apply to the Scottish bishops. He did not, however, require to be informed that an Episcopal communion existed in Scotland, if the following narrative by an American writer may be relied on:—"A young Episcopalian from Connecticut, in going to Edinburgh to procure a medical degree, requested his host, the Sunday after his arrival, to tell him where he might find an Episcopal service or church. 'I will shew you,' said his host; 'Take your hat and follow me. But we are watched with jealousy by the Presbyterians; do not come near me; keep me barely in sight.' So, following his guide at a distance, through the ins and outs and windings of some unfrequented streets, the stranger at length saw his host disappear suddenly into a dilapidated building, some five or six stories high, on the side of a steep hill; and following still the sound of footsteps into the fifth or sixth story, there worshipped God, according to the dictates of his conscience. This youth became afterwards a shining light at our altars, and is known in our annals as Bishop Seabury, the Apostle of America." (A Presbyterian Clergyman looking for the Church, ed. 1853, pp. 321, 322.)

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 47. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 683. Skinner's Annals, pp. 68, 87, 536.

² Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 57-61.

to Bishop Petrie, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Murray and Aberdeen. Bishop Petrie, who was in infirm health at the time, died on the nineteenth of the following month. The only act by which he is generally known is his share in the consecration of Dr. Seabury, but the memorials which have been preserved shew that he was a man of primitive humility and piety. His house at Folla, in the diocese of Aberdeen, was a seminary for the education of young men intended for the ministry of the Church; and, in the discharge of this meritorious work, he was assisted by the possession of a valuable library, which had been bequeathed to him by his mother's brother, Bishop Alexander. Among his pupils was Bishop Jolly, and that divine, then a presbyter at Turriff, preached his funeral sermon. He spoke of the deceased prelate as "one of the best men he ever knew;" and with him these were not mere words of form. Bishop Petrie, he said, had such a sense of the importance of the ministerial function, that he had been often heard to declare that nothing but the great scarcity of labourers, and the necessities of the Church, could have prevailed upon him to undertake it. Bishop Jolly added: "With this love to God above all, he had a great love to mankind, which necessarily springs from it; and he made it his constant business to promote the good of their souls and bodies. The Church—the body and spouse of Christ—and its welfare, he had the most ardent zeal for; in the promoting of which he laid out the vigour of his mind, and the strength of his body. He went about doing good, journeying unweariedly and without consideration of his bodily health, carried on beyond his strength by the love he had to the interests of Christ's spiritual kingdom, the principle which alone actuated him. If that went well, he rejoiced in the midst of pain and bodily weakness. If any detriment or hurt seemed to threaten the Church, no outward thing could make him cheerful. Indeed, the pleasures of the body he had so entirely got above, that I am very apt to think such a thorough conquest of them has been rarely seen in these latter times; so well had he copied the example of the blessed Apostle, who kept under his body, and brought it into subjection, lest by any means, when he preached to others, he himself should be a cast-away."

Bishop Petrie was succeeded by his coadjutor, Bishop Macfarlane.¹

Dr. William Abernethy Drummond, who, in the previous year, had declined to accept the diocese of Dunkeld, having been elected to the vacant see of Brechin, was consecrated at Peterhead, on the twenty-sixth of September, 1787, by the Primus, Bishop Kilgour, and the Bishops of Aberdeen and Murray. John Strachan, a presbyter in Dundee, was consecrated at the same time as coadjutor to the new bishop. On this occasion the diocese of Argyll was annexed to the dioceses of Ross and Caithness, under the superintendence of Bishop Macfarlane. Dr. Drummond was soon afterwards chosen bishop by the clergy of Edinburgh, and was succeeded in the see of Brechin by his coadjutor.²

On the thirty-first of January, 1788, Prince Charles died at Rome. His only brother, Henry, Duke of York, a cardinal of the Roman Church, asserted his right to the throne of Britain, but his pretensions were universally disregarded. The Scottish bishops and clergy, who had been the most faithful adherents of the house of Stewart, were now satisfied that they could conscientiously swear allegiance to the sovereign in possession, the benefits of whose mild rule they had experienced, and whose religious and upright character they revered. They had been reluctant to make any change during the life of Charles, but they now hesitated no longer.

All the diocesan synods met, and agreed as to the propriety and expediency of publicly recognizing the title of King George, and of praying for him by name in the offices of the Church. An episcopal synod was in consequence summoned by the Primus to meet at Aberdeen, on the twenty-fourth of April, at which also, in terms of the canons of 1743, the deans, as representing the presbyters, were requested to attend. The members of the synod unanimously resolved to give evidence

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 47, 48. Skinner, vol. ii. p. 687. Skinner's Annals, p. 67. Stephen, vol. iv. p. 407-409. Stephen's Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. p. 330-332. Mr. Pressley's Sermon on the death of Bishop Jolly, pp. 22, 23. The date of Bishop Petrie's decease is given in the inscription on his tombstone in the churchyard of Dunbennan, near Huntly, formerly a prebendal church in the diocese of Murray.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 48, 49. Skinner, vol. ii. pp. 687. 688.

of their submission to their sovereign, by praying for him in the express words of the English Liturgy. In consequence of this determination, circulars were issued by the bishops, enjoining the clergy to intimate to their congregations on the eighteenth of May, that, on the following Sunday, prayers for King George would be introduced into the public services. In terms of this injunction, on Sunday the twenty-fifth of May, every clergyman of the Church, with the exception of one, prayed for King George, the queen, and the members of the royal family. Immediately after the synod, the bishops addressed a letter to Lord Sydney, Secretary of State, mentioning the resolution which they had come to, and requesting that it might be laid before the king; to which they received a gracious reply. Intimation of what was done at the synod was also made to two English presbyters—the only surviving clergy, it may be presumed, of the Nonjuring body which, in terms of Bishop Gordon's letter, had come under the care of the Scottish prelates.

Almost all the laity concurred in the decision of the bishops and clergy. The few who still clung to their Jacobite opinions were encouraged by the single presbyter who refused to pray for King George—James Brown, of Montrose. Bishop Rose was also unwilling to comply with the change, but he was nearly in a state of dotage, and had been unable to attend the synod. He was induced to consecrate Mr. Brown to the episcopal function; and the latter, in virtue of this irregular act, ordained a person named Donald M'Intosh to the priesthood. But no further ordinations took place, and with the death of these individuals the schism came to an end.¹

Bishop Skinner, from the time of his consecration, had taken a leading part in all measures connected with the general welfare of the Church. He had supported the propriety of raising Seabury to the episcopate, and had defended the principle on which he and his brethren acted, in a sermon which he preached on that occasion. He had maintained the expediency of acknowledging the reigning family; and now that he was raised to the primacy, he directed his zeal and energy to an

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 49-52. Skinner, vol. ii. pp. 688, 689. Skinner's Annals, p. 75-84. Stephen, vol. iv. pp. 412-415, 419, 420. Stephen's Episcopal Magazine, vol. iv. p. 189-192.

effort for obtaining the abolition of those penal enactments, which could no longer be justified by any supposed political disaffection, but which pressed heavily on the members of the communion over which he presided.

In the spring of 1789, the Primus and the Bishops of Edinburgh and Brechin proceeded to London, in order to lay their claims for relief before the government and the legislature. They had the assistance of most of the Scottish members of both houses. No opposition was made by the established Church ; and, at a subsequent period, three of the most eminent of its ministers, Principal Robertson of Edinburgh, and Principal Campbell and Dr. Gerard of Aberdeen, gave their active support to the measure. Almost the only persons that opposed it were some of the qualified clergy of English ordination who officiated in Scotland.

Soon after the arrival of the Scottish prelates in London, they addressed a letter to Dr. Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury, explaining their position and claims. They mentioned that, since they came up, they had joined in the public worship of the English Church, with which they declared themselves to be in full communion ; that they believed the Book of Common Prayer to be the best composed liturgy in the world ; that in Scotland they constantly used the Morning and Evening Service of that Book, and also the occasional offices when requisite ; and, though their Eucharistic service was the Scottish Office, nearly as authorized by King Charles the First, that they did not make it a condition of communion, but allowed their clergy to use either the Scottish or the English Office, and that some of them actually used the latter. The archbishop requested to see them at Lambeth. It was the first time that an English primate had received a Scottish bishop in his palace, since Archbishop Sancroft and Bishop Rose met there a century before. The archbishop was kind and respectful ; but he mentioned that the episcopal bench could not then take their business into consideration, as its attention was engrossed by a motion about to be made in parliament in favour of the English Dissenters. Dr. Horsley, at that time Bishop of St. David's, took much interest in their proceedings. Dr. Bagot, Bishop of Norwich, on whose support the qualified clergy in Scotland relied, admitted the rea-

sonableness of the claim made by the Primus and his colleagues; but he stated that it would require to be carefully considered, and that the archbishop had been at great pains to obtain correct information as to their position and that of the qualified clergy, in regard to which, till within a few years, the English prelates hardly knew anything.

In order that the prime minister, Mr. Pitt, and Lord Chancellor Thurlow, might be rightly informed as to the claims on behalf of the Episcopal Church, a paper was drawn up, under the direction of the bishops, by Sir James Allan Park, then a young barrister, entitled "The Case of the Episcopal clergy in Scotland, and of the laity of their communion." This document contained a recital of the Toleration Act of Queen Anne, and of the penal statutes of the reigns of George the First and George the Second; and concluded with a petition that the latter statutes might be repealed, and that the oaths ordered by the former act, so far as they had a retrospective effect, might be adjusted in such a manner that the Episcopal clergy would be able sincerely and conscientiously to enjoy its benefits. A bill, embodying the proposed clauses, passed through the House of Commons without any opposition; but, in the House of Lords, an adjournment of the second reading was moved by the chancellor, and its supporters thought it more expedient to acquiesce, than to provoke such an opponent.

The precise grounds of the chancellor's opposition are not explained. He seems to have taken offence at some supposed want of deference to himself. He insisted on retaining the oath of abjuration, though it was stated to him that, as that oath had a retrospective effect, it could hardly be taken except by those who never believed the right which it disclaimed; and he maintained that there could be no bishops without the king's authority. This last opinion excited the astonishment of the Scottish prelates, and, in a letter to Bishop Warren of Bangor, who was supposed to be in the confidence of the chancellor, they freely expressed their sentiments in the following words:—"That there could be no bishop without the king's authority, was an assertion by one who professed himself a member of an Episcopal Church, which not a little surprised us. Were this the case, the apostolic power of

consecrating bishops must have been lost as soon as obtained ; hence there is at this day not one bishop in the whole Christian world. It is well known, my lord, that the Church of England, from the murder of Charles the First to the restoration of his son, was covered with as dark a cloud as ever overshadowed her unfortunate sister Church in Scotland. Nay, had Richard Cromwell been as ambitious and as able a man as his father Oliver, her misery might have been as great and as lasting as that of the Scottish Church has been. But we thank God it was not so. We bless the Almighty that the Church of England was restored ; and we pray to God she may not only subsist, but flourish in purity and peace till time shall be no more. Yet, for argument's sake, my lord, let us suppose that the Church of England had not been restored, but had subsisted under persecution, as our Church has done to the present day, would your lordship, would any English prelate, have admitted that the Church of England had no bishops ? And would not the bishops have thought it hard, upon acknowledging the civil powers, to be denied the liberty of worshipping God in their accustomed forms, as well as the right of spiritual jurisdiction over the people who adhered to their communion ? Yet this is all we presume to ask ; and certainly it is what, in this age of liberality, will not, nay, cannot be denied us. Wherefore we do again beg leave to propose a friendly meeting with your lordship on the subject of this letter ; since we have hopes that, on hearing a just representation of our case, your lordship will have the goodness to endeavour to soften the Lord Chancellor, and to procure for our cause that generous treatment in the House of Lords with which it has been honoured in the House of Commons. The Scottish members of both houses know how generally acceptable our success will be in our own country. And when we inform your lordship, that there are many gentlemen in Scotland, who have taken all the oaths to government, and have distinguished themselves in the service of their country, who, notwithstanding, are restrained from praying for the king, whom they have faithfully served, in our religious assemblies, without forfeiting very essential privileges, and are obliged either to join in other worship which they do not approve, or go to no place of worship at all, we need say no

more to point out to your lordship, whose principles on the subject of the Church are represented to us as strictly correct, the unhappy effects of these political restraints, and the propriety of removing them as speedily as possible."

A cold reply, declining the proffered conference, was all that the Bishop of Bangor vouchsafed to this expostulation.

When the Primus and his colleagues returned to Scotland, they prudently resolved to give an account to the whole Church of what had been done, with the view of consulting in common regarding a matter in which all were concerned. For that purpose, a convention of the bishops and clergy, and of lay delegates from all the congregations, was held at Laurencekirk on Martinmas day. This was the first occasion, since the Revolution, on which the laity had been summoned to meet for consultation along with the clergy. The Primus explained in his opening address that, as the object of the assembly was of a temporal nature, and not immediately connected with any thing purely ecclesiastical, with any thing, as he stated, regarding the doctrine, worship, or discipline of the Church, there was no necessity for proceeding according to ecclesiastical rule, or the canons of their own communion. He therefore declared that the meeting was no synod or assembly purely ecclesiastical, nor to be deemed a precedent for such in the Episcopal Church; and therefore that he claimed no right to preside. The Primus was unanimously chosen president of the convention, and it was resolved that each incumbent and each congregation should have one vote. The meeting approved of what the bishops had done at London, and named a committee of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen, with full power to take all farther measures for obtaining a repeal of the penal statutes.

Soon after the meeting, the Primus was informed that three of his English friends, Mr. Park, Dr. Gaskin, secretary to the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, and William Stevens, treasurer of Queen Anne's Bounty, had formed themselves into a committee to correspond with that named in Scotland, for the promotion of the same object. In the course of the following year, he ascertained that in the new bill a clause would be inserted prohibiting the orders given by Scottish bishops from being received as a qualification for

preferment in England. He remonstrated against such a clause, which had not been thought necessary in the former bill, and suggested a modified provision, making the qualification dependent on the consent of the bishop of the English diocese. He was assured, however, that even Bishop Horsley was satisfied that his modification could not be carried; and it was explained to him that the clause was required on account of the king's ecclesiastical supremacy within his own dominions, in consequence of which no act, done without his consent, could have any civil effect, and thus, although the orders of a foreign Popish bishop would qualify for institution, those of a Popish bishop who was one of the king's subjects would not. The Primus was obliged to acquiesce in what he could not avoid, though he foresaw the probability of the restriction being extended to the ministrations of the clergy, as well as to their holding benefices.

It was found impossible to introduce the relief bill for some time; but, in the year 1792, it was again brought forward, and on this occasion it was first proposed in the House of Lords. The Primus, at the request of the Scottish committee, repaired to London to watch its progress. The Lord Chancellor Thurlow was still unfavourable, though he did not directly oppose the introduction of the bill. At the second reading, he stated that it was desirable the clergy in Scotland should be ordained by English or Irish bishops. In answer to this remark, Bishop Horsley observed: "My lords, with respect to the interests of Episcopacy in Scotland, my opinion is unfortunately the very reverse of that of the noble and learned lord. The credit of Episcopacy will never be advanced by the scheme of supplying the Episcopalian congregations in Scotland with pastors of our ordination; and for this reason, my lords, that it would be an imperfect, crippled Episcopacy, that would thus be upheld in Scotland. When a clergyman ordained by one of us settles as a pastor of a congregation in Scotland, he is out of the reach of our authority. We have no authority there; we can have no authority there; the legislature can give us no authority there. The attempt to introduce anything of an authorised political Episcopacy in Scotland would be a direct infringement of the Union. My lords, as to the notion that clergymen should be originally ordained by us

to the ministry in Scotland, the thing would be contrary to all rule and order. No bishop, who knows what he does, ordains without a title, and a title must be a nomination to something certain in the diocese of the bishop that ordains. My lords, an appointment to an Episcopal congregation in Scotland is no more a title to me, or to any bishop of the English bench, or any bishop of the Irish bench, than an appointment to a church in Mesopotamia."

The second reading was agreed to without a division; but, immediately after it, Bishop Horsley, and some of the temporal peers who supported the bill, intimated their opinion to the Primus that, in order to meet certain of the chancellor's scruples, it would be desirable the Scottish clergy should shew their entire agreement with the English Church, by subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles of that Church. The Primus answered that he believed the clergy had no objections to the general doctrine of the Articles, although they might not approve of some particular expressions; but he objected to their being required to subscribe them as the "Articles of the Church of England," since the Scottish Episcopal Church was no part of the Church of England, and could not, either in strictness of principle or propriety of language, be included in it. It was said, in reply, that it was only the general doctrine of the Articles to which subscription was required even in England; and that they might be subscribed by the Scottish clergy, in proof of their wish to be considered in communion with the English Church.

The bill, as amended in committee, was finally agreed to by the Lords; but, when it was before the Commons, it was discovered that, in consequence of its containing some money clauses, it would require to be thrown out, although it might again be immediately introduced. This was accordingly done; and it passed through the Commons with no objection, except a remark from Mr. Fox, that the king's ministers were very ready to grant relief to one class of Dissenters in Scotland, although they had opposed a motion of his in favour of the English Unitarians. It again went through its various stages in the House of Lords, and, on the fifteenth of June, received the royal assent.

The act repealed certain clauses of the statutes of Queen

Anne, George the First, and George the Second. It then provided that all persons, exercising the function of pastors or ministers in any Episcopal congregation, should take and subscribe the oaths of allegiance and abjuration, and the assurance, and should subscribe a declaration of assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and, during divine service, should pray for the king and the royal family in the same form as in the English Liturgy. It was declared that all persons, exercising these functions, should be incapable of holding any benefice, curacy, or other spiritual promotion in England, or of officiating in any church or chapel in England, where the Liturgy was used, unless they were ordained by an English or Irish bishop. Penalties were imposed on laymen, who should attend any chapel or meeting-house in which prayers were not said for the king and the royal family. All other restrictions imposed on the laity by former statutes were repealed; but the clergy were declared to be liable in certain penalties, in the event of their contravening the provisions of the act.¹

The Primus returned home on the passing of the statute. He had discharged the task imposed upon him with faithfulness and ability. So far as the laity were concerned, the boon conferred was ample and sufficient. If the clergy were still liable to penalties for declining to take the oath of abjuration, if the adoption of the English Articles of Religion was imposed upon them, while they were expressly debarred from all the emoluments of the English Church, and were prohibited from officiating in its congregations, these obligations and restrictions were imposed in opposition to the wishes of the Bishop of Aberdeen, and notwithstanding the efforts which he made to obtain exemption from them.

¹ Skinner's Annals, p. 87-229. See also a Narrative of the proceedings relating to the Relief Act, published at Aberdeen in 1792.

CHAPTER LXXXIII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE REPEAL OF THE PENAL LAWS IN JUNE, 1792, TO THE DEATH OF
KING GEORGE III. IN JANUARY, 1820.

Second Convention of the clergy and laity at Laurencekirk—Proposal to appoint Jonathan Boucher to the see of Edinburgh—Opinions of the Hutchinsonians—Consecration of Bishop Jolly—Convocation of the clergy at Laurencekirk—Speech of Bishop Jolly—The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England adopted—Articles of Union offered to the clergy of English ordination—Election and consecration of Dr. Sandford to the see of Edinburgh—Episcopal Synod at Aberdeen—Synod of the bishops and clergy at Aberdeen—Canons agreed to by the Synod—Death of Bishop Skinner—Bishop Gleig appointed Primus—Death of King George the Third.

ONE of the first acts of the Primus, on his return to Scotland, was to summon a meeting of his constituents, the clergy and lay delegates of the Church. The convention again met at Laurencekirk, on the twenty-second of August, and the Primus, as before, was chosen president. He addressed the members in a long speech, in which, while he admitted that there were several portions of the act which might better have been left out, he explained the absolute necessity there was for consenting to those provisions, if any measure of relief at all was to be obtained. He regretted strongly the imposition of the oath of abjuration which he had always declared the clergy could not conscientiously take; but he attached less importance to the restriction from holding benefices in England. "For my own part," he said, "I am at a loss to determine whether we have or have not reason to complain of it. Time will shew how it is likely to operate, and I would fain hope that there is as much probability of its being friendly, as of its being prejudicial, to the interests of our Church, so long as our

Church is considered in its true light, viz. as a society which has no other object but the promotion of true religion, and which, therefore, ought to have none else for its ministers but those who expect their reward in a better country than England, and from a Master whose kingdom is not of this world." Referring to the subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles, he said, that the inconvenience, and apparent impropriety, which some might ascribe to the ecclesiastical anomaly of one Church being required, whether her clergy would or not, to subscribe the articles of another, could be prevented by the Episcopal Church in Scotland adopting as her own the Articles of the Church of England, in like manner with the Liturgy of that Church; and he added, that this was a matter which, he trusted, would soon receive the serious consideration it deserved.

The meeting unanimously approved of all that had been done in connection with the Relief Act.¹

Bishop Rose having died in April, 1791, Jonathan Watson, a presbyter at Laurencekirk, was chosen bishop by the clergy of Dunkeld, and was consecrated at Stonehaven, on the twentieth of September, 1792, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Edinburgh, Murray, and Brechin. At the same time, the districts of Fife and Dunblane were united, and intimation was made to the clergy that they might apply for a mandate to elect a bishop; but they did not avail themselves of the privilege.²

There was nothing which the Primus had more at heart than the restoration to the unity of the Church of those congregations which existed in most of the large towns, claiming connection with the Church of England, but refusing obedience to the Scottish bishops. The origin of these congregations has already been explained. The bishops had not been altogether without blame in the matter. Not satisfied with refusing to violate their own conscience by acknowledging a dynasty whose title they believed to be unlawful, they had also, on some occasions, visited with ecclesiastical censures those of their clergy who had no such scruples. Allegiance to the

¹ Skinner's Annals, pp. 233, 245-255.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 53, 54. Skinner's Annals, p. 257.

house of Stewart had never indeed been made an article of communion. The laity were not required to make any profession whatever on the point; and persons of all political opinions could join in public worship, as in the prayers for the sovereign no name was mentioned.

Whatever palliation the conduct of the qualified clergy and their congregations might have admitted at one time, all causes of separation were removed when the Scottish prelates acknowledged the house of Hanover, and when the penal laws were in consequence repealed. In one or two instances, accordingly, the independent congregations submitted to their bishops, but the rest still persisted in the schism. It was in the South that the qualified clergy were most numerous; and the Primus thought their prejudices would be overcome, and a union facilitated, were a clergyman of English ordination appointed to the see of Edinburgh. The opinion was a wise and prudent one, and he was enabled to attempt carrying it out by the self-denying conduct of Bishop Drummond, who offered to resign his diocese for so good an object.

The individual whom the Primus thought best fitted as an instrument for putting an end to the schism was Jonathan Boucher, formerly a clergyman in Maryland, and now Vicar of Epsom. He was distinguished for learning and zeal, and for devotion to the duties of his function. His principles accorded well with those of his friends in Scotland. He held the same ecclesiastical opinions, and his loyalty to King George was of that fearless and unworldly character which had marked the devotion of the Scottish clergy to the house of Stewart. When the revolt began in America, he remained faithful to his sovereign, and was compelled to return to Britain, after his property had been confiscated, and himself proscribed as a traitor, by the insurgents. The bishops would gladly have welcomed such a man as their colleague, and the clergy of Scottish ordination were equally well disposed. Boucher came to Edinburgh in 1793, and expressed his willingness to accept of the office, but the proposal was finally unsuccessful. It was reported that a scheme was in agitation for introducing bishops into Scotland, with the sanction of the government. Some members of the Scottish establishment, and of the Dissenting bodies, became alarmed; suspicion was

excited among the separatist congregations in Edinburgh; and Boucher himself declined to proceed farther in the matter.¹

Bishop Skinner had become acquainted with Boucher through their mutual friendship with Dr. Seabury, and his regard was increased by personal intercourse during his visits to London. But it is probable the conviction which he entertained of his fitness for the episcopal office was strengthened by the circumstance, that they held common opinions on a subject to which many men of ability and eminence at that time attached much more importance than was reasonable. They both entertained those peculiar views, partly theological, partly philosophical, regarding the meaning of the Scriptures, and particularly the original language of the Old Testament, which were propounded in the writings of John Hutchinson. Among the disciples of that school in England, were most of those good men who took a zealous interest in the welfare of the Scottish Church—Bishop Horne, Jones of Nayland, William Stevens, and others. In Scotland, the opinions of Hutchinson were maintained by John Skinner, the ecclesiastical historian, through whose teaching they were adopted by his son, the Primus; by some others of the bishops; and by a considerable number of the clergy. They were not confined, however, to the adherents of Episcopacy, Lord President Forbes having been one of their firmest supporters.

The opinions of Hutchinson did not in themselves contradict any essential principle of faith or morals, and those who held them shewed no disposition to encourage schismatical division. But it was probably fortunate for the cause of Episcopacy in Scotland, that Boucher was not raised to the see of Edinburgh. His ability and his virtues would have given him great influence; and, had the Hutchinsonian opinions become prevalent in the South, as they already were in some of the northern dioceses, the teaching of a body so small in number as the Scottish clergy might have been seriously and permanently affected. As it was, these tenets were forgotten almost as soon as their chief supporters passed away.²

¹ Skinner's Annals, p. 265-270. In regard to Boucher, see *Memoirs of William Stevens* by Sir James Allan Park, 4th ed. p. 120-123, and *Dr. Hawks' History of the Church of Maryland*, p. 269-271.

² Skinner, in his *History* (vol. ii. p. 673-678), gives an account of Hutchinson.

In the year 1796, Bishop Macfarlane having requested the appointment of a coadjutor, the clergy of Murray and Ross, with his approbation, made choice of Alexander Jolly, a presbyter at Fraserburgh. The bishop-elect was only forty years of age, but he was already known to the members of his own communion for those graces with which his name became afterwards associated. He was born at Stonehaven, on the third of April, 1756, and was educated at Marischal College, Aberdeen. From early youth he appears to have devoted himself to the service of the Church. He was ordained deacon by Bishop Kilgour, on the first of July, 1776, and raised to the priesthood by the same prelate, on the nineteenth of March, 1777; the canonical rules as to age being not unfrequently dispensed with at that time, from the difficulty of finding candidates for holy orders. During the same year in which he was ordained priest, he was appointed to the pastoral charge of Turriff, and, in 1788, to that of Fraserburgh, both in the diocese of Aberdeen.

There was but one opinion as to the fitness of Bishop Jolly for the episcopal office; but his appointment was resisted by the Primus, on the ground that there was no necessity, at that time, for a coadjutor to Bishop Macfarlane. The theological opinions of the bishop-elect were different from those of the Primus. Trained, as already mentioned, in the school of Bishop Petrie, and following in most points the teaching of Gadderar and Rattray, he was opposed to the Hutchinsonian doctrines. But this circumstance does not seem to have influenced the conduct of the Primus, and it certainly had no effect on Bishop Macfarlane, himself a follower of Hutchinson. The objections of the Primus were overruled by the Episcopal College; and Bishop Jolly was consecrated at Dundee, on the feast of the Nativity of S. John the Baptist, by the Bishops of Murray, Edinburgh, and Brechin. In the beginning of the year 1798, Bishop Macfarlane resigned the see of Murray, retaining the superintendence of Ross and Argyll; and, on the fourteenth of February, his coadjutor was elected by the clergy of Murray, and collated to that diocese by the Primus

son's opinions. See also Bishop Skinner's *Life of his Father*, p. cliii-clxxv; Jones's preface to the second edition of his *Life of Bishop Horne*; and Park's *Life of Stevens*, p. 15-19.

and the other bishops, on the twenty-second of the same month.¹

As years passed on, the Primus became satisfied that the only mode of bringing back the separated congregations was the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles by the Scottish clergy, in evidence of their entire conformity with the Church of England. This measure he had referred to in his address to the convention at Laurencekirk in 1792; and now that the restoration of unity among all the adherents of Episcopacy seemed to depend upon it, after consulting with his colleagues, he summoned a convocation of the bishops and clergy to meet at Laurencekirk, on the twenty-fourth of October, 1804, for the consideration of this important subject.

The condition of the Scottish Church, in regard to an authorised standard of doctrine, during the period from the Restoration to the Revolution, was formerly explained. After the Revolution, the old Confession of Faith, to which the state had given a certain degree of authority, was disregarded by the bishops and clergy; and, during the eighteenth century, the only recognised formularies of doctrine, in addition to the Holy Scriptures, were the Creeds in the Book of Common Prayer. These might have been thought sufficient, had it not been for the requirements of the statute of 1792, and the scruples of the clergy of English ordination; the more especially that certain expressions in the Thirty-nine Articles were objected to by some of the Scottish clergy as admitting an interpretation opposed to the teaching of the Church. The Primus himself was of opinion that some explanations were proper, to shew that the Scottish Church rejected the Calvinistic interpretation of the seventeenth and twenty-fifth articles, and to mark in what sense she was willing to receive those which, like the thirty-fifth, thirty-sixth, and thirty-seventh, were peculiar to the Church of England. He proposed to put these explanations in the shape of a preamble to the Articles; but he was induced to give up this design, chiefly in conse-

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 55, 57. Skinner's Annals, pp. 283, 284. Memoir of Bishop Jolly by Dr. Walker, Bishop of Edinburgh, prefixed to the Observations on the Sunday Services, 4th ed. p. 1-12. Memoir of Bishop Jolly by M^r. Cheyne, prefixed to the edition of 1842 of A Friendly Address on Baptismal Regeneration, p. iii.-xii.

quence of a letter from Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo, which convinced him that any addition to the Articles was likely to increase the risk of controversy.

The convocation met on the day appointed. It was attended by the Primus, the Bishops of Ross, Dunkeld, and Murray, thirty-eight presbyters, and two deacons, the Primus presiding in virtue of his office. When the other prelates had delivered their opinions, Bishop Jolly thus spoke: "Our attention, my brethren, on this solemn occasion, is forcibly arrested by these affecting words of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 'Now I beseech you brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment.' This divine admonition, though it leaves room for mutual forbearance in points of less importance and doubtful disputation, (as may be inferred from other passages of St. Paul's Epistles,) yet plainly establishes the necessity of concord and unanimity in all the great articles of faith and religion; and if the professors, much more are the preachers, of Christianity bound to such consent and agreement. 'The form of doctrine,'—'the form of sound words,' we are accordingly charged to 'hold fast in faith and love.' Such forms we find recorded by the most early ecclesiastical writers, particularly by Irenæus and Tertullian, in the age next to the Apostles. Afterwards, when the vain imaginations of men corrupted the simplicity of the 'truth as it is in Jesus,' the Church was obliged to counteract the poison by antidotes suited to the several errors as they arose. Hence confessions and formularies of faith came to be multiplied and enlarged, dilated in words, but the same in substance as at first delivered to the saints.

"When the dismal night of Romish error and delusion began to be dispelled by the dawn of Reformation, access was not at first, and in all places, so easy as could have been wished to those early monuments which would have most clearly detected and exposed the innovations and corruptions whereby the primitive faith and practice had been so grossly adulterated, and happily furnished the uniform standard of doctrine and discipline, stamped with antiquity, universality, and consent, the safe and golden rule of reformation. Different

confessions were drawn up in different countries ; and it is rather wonderful that amidst such variety so much harmony prevailed as we find.

“ The Church of England has been justly called the bulwark of the Reformation ; and her superior strength and beauty consist in her wise regard to primitive antiquity, whereby she threw off the adventitious morbid matter which burdened her constitution, and returned to her early health and vigour. Her first reformed admirable Liturgy, composed (as an act of parliament expresses it) ‘ by the aid of the Holy Ghost,’ spoke her sense of religion in the most solemn manner before God ; and she could not be supposed to hold out a different doctrine to men in her Articles, the same persons being the framers of both. The first draft of those Articles of Religion was drawn by the great Archbishop Cranmer, assisted by the primitively learned Ridley, in the year 1551 ; and, after passing from hand to hand among the bishops for their correction, came before the royal council in the end of the following year, was returned to the archbishop for his last revisal, and passed the convocation. These Articles, forty-two in number, were published in Latin and English in the year 1553.

“ The Marian persecution drove many of the English divines abroad ; and it is matter of regret, rather than of wonder, that upon the return of peace they brought some foreign doctrine home with them. When the Church reviewed her Articles in the year 1562, she prudently contrived, by retrenching some, and making alterations in the frame of others, suited to the state of things at that time, to admit a general subscription of persons agreeing in the main, and forbearing one another in love, that they might ‘ endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.’ These Articles, agreed upon in the convocation of 1562, were first emitted in Latin only ; and there was no authentic English translation of them till the year 1571, when they were again reviewed by the convocation, brought to their present form, and published authoritatively both in Latin and English.

“ In the following century, when an unhappy Pharisaic leaven spread to an alarming degree, we find, by the king’s declaration, first published in 1628, and still prefixed to the Articles, that the dissentients all appealed to them as favouring

their different opinions. The royal declaration plainly tended to repress the extravagance of the Calvinists; and it is well known that Archbishop Laud, and other divines in the greatest favour with King Charles, were far from being inclined to the sentiments of Geneva, or the Synod of Dort, or the bare sacramentarian doctrine of the Lord's Supper. They, therefore, must have understood the Articles, and subscribed them, according to the belief of their first framers, who regarded Melancthon more than Calvin. At that time Bishop Montague maintained their anti-calvinistic sense in his Appeal, as Dr. Heylin did afterwards in his *Quinquarticular History*; and in the present day, among others, Mr. Daubeny, now Archdeacon of Salisbury, has most satisfactorily cleared them from the false glosses of modern Calvinists, in his excellent work, entitled *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

“From the writings of Archbishop Cranmer, and others, his contemporaries, it has been proved that the expresions in the Articles, which Calvinistic divines lay hold of and misinterpret, do not, in their original meaning, favour their peculiar tenets. The ‘*Institution and Erudition of a Christian Man*,’ with the ‘*Reformatio Legum*’ &c., drawn up by those first Reformers, explain and amplify here and there what is more condensed and less perspicuous in the Articles: and happily, we too in Scotland have of late got our authentic *Institution of a Christian Man*, in a little book, called ‘*A Layman's Account of his Faith and Practice as a Member of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, published with the approbation of the bishops of that Church.’ In adopting, therefore, the Articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, as the articles of our Church, we must be candidly understood as taking them in unison with that book, and not thinking any expressions with regard to the Lord's Supper in the least inimical to our practice at the altar, in the use of the *Scottish Communion Office*, in which we are supported by the first reformed Liturgy of England, not to look back to all the ancient liturgies which prevailed long before the corruptions of Popery had a being. Some of the greatest divines of the Church of England, Poinet, Andrews, Laud, Heylin, Mede, Taylor, Bull, Johnson, and many others, have asserted and maintained the doctrine which in that office is reduced to practice. Yet these divines did all

subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, and must therefore have understood them consistently with their belief of the commemorative sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, using the present Liturgy of the Church of England as comprehending it. Our subscribing them in Scotland cannot then be justly interpreted as an inconsistency with it, since our belief is diametrically opposite to the corrupt sacrifice of the Mass, which, with all the other errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, none more heartily renounce and detest than we in Scotland do, with safety always to those truly Catholic, primitive doctrines and practices, whereof these errors and novelties are the corruption. The term corruption implies a subject once sound, and error implies original truth from which it is a deviation. This distinction the Church of England, in her blessed Reformation, carefully observed. Her practice of Confirmation may be taken as an example.

“Confirmation by the laying on of episcopal hands is plainly warranted by the doctrine and practice of the Apostles, and was religiously and universally continued and kept up by the primitive Church. But the Church of Rome, in her degenerate state, justled out the laying on of hands, and exalted the chrism, which had been before used only as a decent, mutable ceremony, into the place of it. The Church of England, therefore, while she retains and solemnly uses, with fervent prayer to God, (as does her poor sister in Scotland,) the certifying sign of the laying on of hands, after the example of the holy Apostles, yet, in her twenty-fifth Article of Religion, condemns the corruption of that example by the Church of Rome, which makes the chrism the outward visible sign of a sacrament, raising it to the same level with the elements in Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, thus too truly making void a divine institution by human tradition. Let any one compare the two offices of England and of Rome, and he will clearly see what is here briefly, and therefore perhaps unintelligibly, stated. Instead of ‘*Confirmo te Chrismate Salutis in Nomine Patris,*’ &c., as it is in the Pontificale Romanum, it was in the first reformed Prayer Book of England more pointedly staring the usurping ceremony in the face than at present, ‘*I lay mine hands upon thee, in the Name of the Father,*’ &c. In the prayer after all are confirmed, the Pontificale reads, ‘*Præsta*

ut eorum corda, quorum frontes sacro Chrismate delinivimus,' &c. In the English Liturgy, it is, 'We make our humble supplications unto Thee, for these thy servants, upon whom, (after the example of thy holy Apostles,) we have now laid our hands,' &c. The latter is the following, or true imitation, of the Apostles; the former is the corrupt following of the Apostles, which the Twenty-fifth Article censures. The learned Mr. Daubeney, in his work above referred to, agrees with those who acknowledge that some of the Articles 'might have been better expressed,' and that 'though an admirable, yet they are an improvable form of sound words.' Much more might we in Scotland claim our right of expressing that true sense of them, which he, and other worthy churchmen, have so fully evinced in words less liable to be misunderstood. But instead of a new form, we adopt and embrace theirs, out of our love and desire of unity and concord; that, being of one heart and mind, in our one Lord Jesus Christ, we may, as with one mouth, all speak the same thing, to the glory of God, and our mutual edification.

"I shall, therefore, detain you no longer, my brethren, than by quoting a caution from two writers on this subject, which seems very suitable to the present occasion:—'In matters of subscription,' says Dr. Bennet, in his Directions for studying the Articles, 'a man ought to take effectual care that he deals openly and fairly; that he does not trifle with sacred obligations, and play with settled impositions, and thereby give his conscience either such a wrench as may often make his heart ache, or such a loose as may debauch it in other instances.'—'A good man,' says Dr. Conybeare, in an excellent sermon on Subscription to Articles, 'will be cautious but not subtle; he will first examine with impartiality and care, and then subscribe with sincerity and plainness.'"

After some farther discussion, all the prelates and clergy present declared their willingness to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, and they accordingly did so in the following form:—
 "We, the bishops and clergy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, assembled in a convocation holden at Laurencekirk, in the county of Kincardine, on the twenty-fourth day of October, in the year of our Lord 1804, having taken into our serious consideration the obligation which we lie under to provide, as

far as we are able, for the preservation of truth, unity, and concord, in that small portion of the Church committed to our charge, and having observed with regret that, owing to the confusions of the times, and the various difficulties which the Episcopacy of Scotland had to encounter, even when established by law, no public Confession of Faith has been prescribed, or handed down to us who have thought it our duty to adhere to that ecclesiastical constitution which we believe to be truly apostolical, under these circumstances, are unanimously of opinion, that it would be highly expedient to exhibit some public testimony of our agreement in doctrine and discipline with the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established, and, for that purpose, to give a solemn declaration of our assent to her Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, in the words and form of subscription required by the act of the thirty-second year of his present majesty, entitled ‘An act for granting relief to Ministers, Pastors, and Lay Persons of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland.’

“Resolved, therefore, as we now are, by the grace of Almighty God, to adopt these Articles as the public test or standard of the religious principles of our Church, We, whose names are underwritten, the bishops and pastors of congregations of the Episcopal communion in Scotland, meeting for divine worship at the several places annexed to our respective names, do, willingly and ex animo, subscribe to the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces of the realm of England, and the clergy thereof, in the convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord 1562; and we do acknowledge all and every the Articles therein contained, being in number Thirty-nine, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the word of God. And we, the subscribing bishops, have also resolved in future to require from all candidates for holy orders in our Church, previously to their being ordained, a similar subscription.”¹

¹ Skinner's Annals, p. 334-350. See also the appendix to that work, p. 539-549, where Bishop Skinner's proposed preamble and Bishop Jolly's address are inserted. The work called “A Layman's Account of his Faith and Practice, as a member of the Episcopal Church of Scotland,” referred to in Bishop Jolly's address, was published anonymously in 1801, at the special request of the Primus, and with the approbation of his colleagues. It is understood to have

In the belief that the acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles by the Scottish clergy would lead to a termination of the schism among the adherents of Episcopacy, certain articles of union had been prepared by the bishops, and were now offered to the clergy of English and Irish ordination. These articles, with the preamble, were the following:—"As an union of all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland appears to be a measure extremely desirable, and calculated to promote the interests of true religion, the right reverend the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church do unite and exhort all those clergymen in Scotland, who have received ordination from English or Irish bishops, and the people attending their ministrations, to become pastors and members of that pure and primitive part of the Christian Church, of which the bishops in Scotland are the regular governors. With a view to the attainment of which desirable end, the said bishops propose the following articles of union as the conditions on which they are ready to receive the above-mentioned clergy into a holy and Christian fellowship, and to acknowledge them as pastors, and the people who shall be committed to their charge and duly and regularly adhere to their ministrations as members, of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

"I. Every such clergyman shall exhibit to the bishop of the diocese or district in which he is settled, or, in case of a vacancy, to the Primus of the Episcopal College, his letters of orders, or a duly attested copy thereof, that so, their authenticity and validity being ascertained, they may be entered in the diocesan book or register kept for that purpose.

"II. Every such clergyman shall declare his hearty and unfeigned assent to the whole doctrine of the Gospel, as revealed and set forth in the Holy Scriptures; and shall farther acknowledge that the Scottish Episcopal Church, of which the bishops in Scotland are the regular governors, is a pure and orthodox part of the Universal Christian Church.

"III. Every such clergyman shall be at liberty to use in his own congregation the Liturgy of the Church of England, as well in the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as in all other offices of the Church.

been the composition of John Niven of Thornton, one of the committee appointed to carry through the Relief Bill.

“ IV. Every such clergyman, when collated to any pastoral charge, shall promise, with God’s assistance, faithfully and conscientiously to perform the duties thereof, promoting and maintaining, according to his power, peace, quietness, and Christian charity, and studying, in a particular manner, to advance, by his example and doctrine, the spiritual welfare and comfort of that portion of the flock of Christ among which he is called to exercise his ministry.

“ V. Every such clergyman shall own and acknowledge as his spiritual governor under Christ, the bishop of the diocese or district in which he is settled, and shall pay and perform to the said bishop all such canonical obedience as is usually paid by the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church, or by the clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, to their respective diocesans, saving and excepting only such obedience as those clergymen, who do or may hold spiritual preferment in England or Ireland, owe to the bishops in whose diocese in those parts of the united kingdom they do or may hold such preferment.

“ VI. Every such clergyman, who shall approve and accept of the foregoing articles as terms of agreement and union with the Scottish Episcopal Church, shall testify his approbation and acceptance of the same in manner following, viz:—‘ At the day of I ordained Deacon by the Lord Bishop of , and Priest by the Lord Bishop of , do hereby testify and declare my entire approbation and acceptance of the foregoing articles as terms of union with the Scottish Episcopal Church, and oblige myself to comply with and fulfil the same with all sincerity and diligence. In testimony whereof, I have written and subscribed this my acceptance and obligation, to be delivered into the hands of the right reverend , Bishop of , as my diocesan and ecclesiastical superior, before these witnesses the rev. , and the rev , both clergymen of the said diocese, specially called for that purpose.’”¹

These articles were certainly framed with the utmost charity and moderation. The clergy who were invited to accept them were not required to admit that they had been previously in a state of schism, or that they had done wrong in remaining

¹ Skinner’s Annals, appendix, p. 553-555.

separate from the Scottish bishops; and they were allowed full liberty, in their own congregations, to use the whole liturgical services of the Church of their ordination. The better disposed among them shewed a proper appreciation of such conduct by accepting the articles. Within a month after the Synod of Laurencekirk, the conditions of union were signed by Dr. Daniel Sandford, one of the clergy of Edinburgh. His example was soon followed by Mr. Archibald Alison and others; and the people under their charge gave their hearty concurrence.

The see of Edinburgh had been vacant for some years by the resignation of Bishop Drummond. A mandate for election was now issued to the clergy; and, on the fifteenth of January, 1806, they made choice of Dr. Sandford, those in Scottish orders unanimously agreeing in the appointment of an English presbyter. The election was confirmed by the Episcopal College; and, on the ninth of February, being Sexagesima Sunday, Dr. Sandford was consecrated at Dundee, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Murray. Bishop Drummond retained the administration of the diocese of Glasgow, which thus, after many years, once more became a distinct see. But the aged prelate did not long survive. He died on the twenty-seventh of August, 1809, and, on his decease, the see of Glasgow was again united to that of Edinburgh.¹

Bishop Watson died on the twenty-eighth of June, 1808. A mandate was issued to the clergy of Dunkeld, and, on the fourteenth of September, the majority gave their voice in favour of Dr. George Gleig, the same clergyman who had on a former vacancy been chosen to the office. Dr. Gleig himself, anxious that the election should be unanimous, and such as would be agreeable to the College of Bishops, requested the clergy to unite in favour of Patrick Torry, a presbyter at Peterhead, whom the minority had supported. Mr. Torry was accordingly elected by the votes of all the clergy on the sixth of October. Their choice was confirmed by the Episcopal College, and, on the twelfth of October, the

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 56. Skinner's Annals, pp. 358-404, 479. Remains of Bishop Sandford, vol. i. pp. 48, 49.

new bishop was consecrated at Aberdeen, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Ross and Murray.¹

The appointment of a coadjutor in the diocese of Brechin having become necessary in consequence of the old age and infirmities of Bishop Strachan, a mandate was issued by the Episcopal College, and, on the twenty-seventh of September, Dr. Gleig was unanimously elected by the clergy. On the election being intimated, the Primus wrote to the bishop-elect that he would consent to ratify the appointment, provided Dr. Gleig were willing to subscribe a declaration, similar in its terms to one which had been signed by Bishop Torry previously to his consecration, and which was to the following effect:—"I the undersigned do hereby voluntarily and ex animo declare, being now about to be promoted, by the mercy of God, to a seat in the Episcopal College in the Church of Scotland, that, when promoted to the episcopate, I will co-operate with my colleagues in supporting a steady adherence to the truths and doctrines by which our Church has been so happily distinguished, and particularly to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as laid down in our excellent Communion Office, the use of which I will strenuously recommend by my own practice, and by every other means in my power."

To this proposal Dr. Gleig at once expressed his ready assent. In the letter which he wrote to the Primus on that occasion, he mentioned that, though he was the only clergyman in the diocese of Edinburgh who used the Scottish Office, he was not the only one who acknowledged its superiority to the English rite; and that Bishop Sandford himself held the same opinion, and had lately expressed his disapprobation of the conduct of one of his clergy who, without any sufficient reason, had substituted the English for the Scottish form. The election to the see of Brechin having been confirmed by the Episcopal College, Dr. Gleig was consecrated at Aberdeen, on Sunday the thirtieth of October, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Murray and Dunkeld. On the death of Bishop Strachan, which took place on the twenty-eighth of January,

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 57. Skinner's Annals, p. 468-471. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, pp. 56, 57, 61-70.

1810, the entire superintendence of the diocese of Brechin devolved on Dr. Gleig.¹

In asking subscription to the declaration regarding the Communion Office, as a condition of his approving the election of the Bishops of Dunkeld and Brechin, the Primus seems to have acted with the concurrence of Bishop Macfarlane and Bishop Jolly. But the regularity and expediency of such a measure may be seriously doubted; and it can hardly be reconciled with the statement made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1789, that the Scottish clergy had a discretionary power to use either office. There can be no question, however, that the Primus believed it to be his duty, at whatever risk of misconception, to do his utmost for the preservation of the Church's most sacred office. He had taken a leading part in establishing the Thirty-nine Articles at the Convocation of Laureneekirk, and afterwards in bringing about a union with the separated congregations on terms very favourable to the English clergy. But, when he saw that a tendency was almost immediately shewn by some presbyters to conform to the English Church in all points, and even to abandon their own Eucharistic use, he became seriously alarmed, and resolved, at all hazards, to prevent the evils which he thought were impending. He expressed himself strongly on the subject, in a charge to the clergy of his own diocese in the autumn of 1806; and he sanctioned the publication, in the following year, of the text of the Scottish Office, and of a dissertation on the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, by his son, John, afterwards Dean of Dunkeld.²

On St. Bartholomew's day, 1809, an episcopal synod was held at Aberdeen, which was attended by the Primus, and by the Bishops of Ross, Murray, Dunkeld, and the Coadjutor of Brechin. The following canons were agreed to, and were signed by the prelates present, Dr. Gleig subscribing also as proxy for the Bishop of Edinburgh:—

“I. That the clergy of one diocese receive no rule or direction from any bishop or priest of any other diocese, under the pain of suspension from all ecclesiastical functions for three

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. pp. 58, 59. Skinner's Annals, p. 471-479.

² Skinner's Annals, pp. 433-435, 440, 441.

months for the first offence, six months for the second, and for the third during their bishop's pleasure.

"II. That they do not interfere, directly or indirectly, in the affairs of any other diocese, under the same penalties, unless they be required so to do by the bishop of that diocese, and have the consent of their own bishop for such interference; it being always understood that they still retain the right of appealing from any sentence of their own bishop, by which they may think themselves aggrieved, to the Primus and other comprovincial bishops, with the representatives of the other clergy met in synod.

"III. That they do not at any time leave, or absent themselves from, their charge, for a longer space than three weeks, without the permission and consent of the bishop of the diocese.

"IV. That they be careful to attend such meetings of the clergy in their respective districts, as may be appointed by the bishop of the diocese, or by the dean in the name and by the authority of the bishop.

"V. That they attend strictly to the rubrics prefixed to the Communion Office.

"VI. That they make no innovation in the service of the Church presently in use, but by the bishop's consent and direction."¹

In August, 1809, Dr. Gleig delivered a charge to the clergy of Brechin. He objected to the numerous and unnecessary changes which were made by many presbyters in the Daily Service, and warned those of his own diocese against them. The Primus, who was in the habit of making such alterations, and who seems to have thought that some of Bishop Gleig's remarks were directed against himself, wrote to that prelate in defence of his own system. The Bishop of Brechin vindicated what he had said in his charge, maintaining the right which he had to give instructions to his own clergy, but disclaiming all interference with other dioceses.²

The Primus had been brought up in the traditions of a school which jealously guarded the purity of apostolical doctrine, and the authority of the episcopal office, but which was

¹ Original Minutes of the Synod in possession of Mr. Cheyne. Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 75, 76.

² Skinner's *Annals*, p. 483-493.

very indifferent regarding uniformity of worship, or beauty and solemnity of ritual. When the propriety of summoning a synod, as the best means of settling the questions in dispute, was urged upon him, he at first declined to do so; but a more careful consideration of the subject satisfied him that this was the best remedy, and, with that conscientious integrity which marked his character, he at once withdrew his objections. The other bishops having agreed as to the propriety of framing a code of canons for the government of the Church, a synod was summoned to meet at Aberdeen, on the nineteenth day of June, 1811.

The synod was attended by all the bishops; by the Deans of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Dunkeld, and Brechin; and by one clergyman from each of those dioceses. At the commencement of the proceedings, Bishop Skinner offered to resign the office of Primus, if his colleagues wished to appoint another in his room, but they all assured him that they had no wish for any change. After a solemn declaration that the assembly thus convened was a regular national synod of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, the Primus thus addressed the clergy:—
“My reverend brethren, the presbyters of the Church here present, you are, I trust, well aware that the bishops, being the proper administrators of the discipline of the Church, are to be considered as the constituent members of every ecclesiastical synod. But the deans of the several districts, and those other presbyters of the Church who have been duly elected to represent their diocesan brethren on this occasion, and who, in that capacity, have been invited to take their place in this synod, are to have the privilege assigned to them by former canons, and by the practice of this Church; that is, they are to be allowed to reason and to debate, to propose and to give their opinions freely, on all those matters of discipline and canonical regulation now to come under our consideration, though not to give any such decisive voice as bishops only have a right to pronounce. In the exercise of this privilege, which your bishops are most happy in feeling themselves, by the practice of the Church in the purest ages, empowered to concede to you, if, during the discussion of the several points of order and discipline on which you are met to deliberate, you shall feel desirous of permission to agitate any question by yourselves, I

have to inform you that another apartment is already allotted for this purpose, to which you are at liberty to retire as often as you may judge proper. And, if you deem it more likely to expedite our business that the result of your deliberations be delivered to us by a chairman or prolocutor, you have only to make choice of one of your number to act in that capacity; when you may be assured that we shall not only listen to his reports with the utmost attention, but be happy in giving our sanction to every proposition of yours, which, as far as we may be able to judge, shall have for its object the true Christian edification of the people committed to our charge—an object only to be effected, in my humble estimation, by a steady adherence to those good and approved principles, by which our humble Church has been hitherto so happily distinguished.”

The clergy availed themselves of the permission given, by electing James Walker, Dean of Edinburgh, to be their prolocutor, and retiring to their own chamber to consider each canon as it was proposed. The synod sat for two days, and approved of the canons, twenty-six in number, which were afterwards published under the title of “The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, drawn up and enacted by an Ecclesiastical Synod, holden for that purpose at Aberdeen, on the nineteenth and twentieth days of June, in the year 1811.”

The first two canons, which related to the preservation of the episcopal succession, and to the election and office of Primus, were substantially the same as the first, second, and twelfth canons of 1743. The third canon, which referred to the election of bishops, contained provisions similar to those in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh canons of 1743; and the fourth canon, regulating the jurisdiction of a bishop whose residence was within the district of another prelate, was the same as the ninth canon of the earlier code.

The fifth canon, “For holding and regulating the business of Ecclesiastical Synods,” made a most important change. The bishops showed their wisdom and moderation by giving their sanction to it, and by admitting the presbyters to a share in the power of legislation. It began:—“Whereas hitherto the constitution of this Church has been such, that a synod, called for the purpose even of enacting a body of laws or

canons, has consisted of the bishops only, aided by the advice of the deans only, who sat with them in the same chamber; and whereas this practice appears inexpedient in the present circumstances of the Church, it is hereby enacted that henceforth every synod, called for the purpose of altering the code of canons, shall consist of two chambers, of which the second shall be composed of the deans, and of the representatives of the clergy, one such representative being chosen from each diocese in which there are more than four presbyters; and that no law or canon shall be enacted or abrogated, but by the consent, and with the approbation, of both chambers." The remaining part of the canon contained the provisions made by the thirteenth and fourteenth canons of 1743.

The sixth and seventh canons, relating to the studies and qualifications of candidates for holy orders, were founded on the second chapter of the canons of 1635, and the seventh canon of 1743.

The eighth canon enjoined that all ordinations should be performed according to the form used in the Church of England for making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

The ninth canon made it obligatory on the clergy, at or before ordination, to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; to abjure the doctrine that princes excommunicated by the Pope might be deposed; to acknowledge the royal supremacy over all estates and persons; and to promise obedience to the canons of the Church.

The tenth canon prescribed rules for institution to a pastoral charge. It declared that the right of presentation belonged to those who provided for the pastor's support; but it forbade any presbyter to take on himself the charge of a congregation before his deed of presentation was duly accepted by the bishop.

The eleventh and twelfth canons, requiring personal residence on the part of clergymen having a pastoral charge, and enjoining soberness of conversation and decency of apparel in ecclesiastical persons, were founded on similar rules in the canons of 1635.

The thirteenth canon pointed out the proper clerical studies, and forbade the clergy of one diocese to interfere in the concerns of another, under reservation of the right of appeal to the College of Bishops, in language almost identical with that of

the tenth canon of 1743, and with the first, second, and fourth canons of 1809.

The fourteenth canon enjoined the due celebration of Divine Service on Sundays and Holy-days.

The fifteenth canon, "Respecting the Communion Service as the most solemn part of Christian Worship," was as follows:—"Whereas it is acknowledged by the twentieth and thirty-fourth of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, that not only the Church in general, but every particular or national Church, 'hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies, or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying,' the Episcopal Church in Scotland, availing herself of this inherent right, hath long adopted and very generally used a form for the celebration of the Holy Communion, known by the name of the Scottish Communion Office, which form has been justly considered, and is hereby considered, as the authorised service of the Episcopal Church in the administration of that sacrament: and as, in order to promote an union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, permission was lately granted by the bishops to retain the use of the English Office in all congregations where the said office had been previously in use, the same permission is now ratified and confirmed: and it is also enacted that, in the use either of the Scottish or English Office, no alteration or interpolation whatever shall take place, nor shall any change from the one to the other be admitted, unless it be agreeable to the minister and his congregation, and approved of by the bishop. In respect, however, to the authority which sanctioned the Scottish Liturgy, and for other good and sufficient reasons, it is hereby enacted that the Scottish Communion Office shall be used in all consecrations of bishops; and that every bishop, when consecrated, shall give his full assent to it, as being sound in itself, and of primary authority in Scotland, and therefore shall not permit its being laid aside, where now used, but by the authority of the College of Bishops."

This provision was intended to secure the primary authority of the Scottish Office as the authorised office of the Church; while it ratified the permission given to use the English Office in those congregations which had come under the

jurisdiction of the bishops. In referring to the authority which sanctioned the Scottish Liturgy, the canon adopted the language used for so many years by the Scottish prelates, and professed to view the existing office as substantially the same with that in the Prayer Book of King Charles the First. The canon was framed by two clergymen of English ordination, Mr. Alison, representative for the diocese of Edinburgh, and Mr. Horsley, son of the Bishop of St. Asaph, representative for the diocese of Brechin.

The sixteenth canon was chiefly intended to prevent those irregularities in the celebration of the Daily Service of which the Bishop of Brechin had lately complained. It consisted of two parts, the first of which ran in the following words:—"As, in all the ordinary parts of Divine Service, it is necessary to fix by authority the precise form from which no presbyter or deacon shall be at liberty to depart, by his own alterations or insertions, lest such liberty should produce consequences destructive of decency and order, it is hereby enacted that, in future, every presbyter or deacon in this Church shall adhere strictly to the words of the English Liturgy in the Morning and Evening Service, unless where, for obvious reasons resulting from the difference between a legal establishment and toleration, his bishop shall authorise any deviations." The second part enjoined the observance of fasts and thanksgivings appointed by the civil authority.

The seventeenth canon enjoined all proper care to be taken of the chapels and places of worship; and also enjoined due reverence in the time of Divine Service, forbidding any person, during its performance, to depart out of the place of worship without some urgent or reasonable cause.

The eighteenth canon required due intimation and preparation to be made for the Holy Communion, ordering that sacrament to be administered so often and at such times as that every one might communicate at least three times in the year, whereof the feast of Easter, or the feast of Pentecost, should be one.

The nineteenth canon showed how entirely the ancient rule of the Church regarding the public celebration of Baptism had been laid aside. It stated that there was scarcely a possibility of persuading parents to bring their children to church in order to be baptized, and that, in consequence, the sacrament was almost

always ministered in private houses. Instead of attempting a remedy, it sanctioned the abuse, and allowed the officiating clergyman, with the approbation of his bishop, to select from the office for Public Baptism in the Book of Common Prayer such parts as were essentially necessary. It likewise allowed parents to be sponsors for their own children, and ended with the following important practical rule in regard to baptism administered out of the communion of the Church :—"Whereas, from the unhappy multiplicity of religious sects in this country, cases frequently occur, in which persons, from conscientious motives, express a desire to separate themselves from such sects, and to unite themselves to the Episcopal communion, it becomes a matter of serious importance to furnish a rule to the clergy, by which they may be directed in such cases ; it is therefore enacted that, in all instances where the applicants shall express a doubt of the validity of the baptism which they may have received from the minister, or pretended minister, of the sect to which they formerly belonged, the clergyman of the Scottish Episcopal Church, to whom the application shall be made, shall baptize the person in the form of words prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, by the Church of England, in similar cases of doubt ; 'If thou art not already baptized, N., I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.' " The charity and moderation of this provision are the more to be commended, inasmuch as, at this time, the absolute invalidity of lay baptism was maintained, as a matter of individual opinion, by most of the bishops and clergy of Scottish ordination.

The twentieth canon required a regular course of catechising in all congregations ; and the twenty-first enjoined bishops to visit their dioceses once in three years, and administer confirmation.

The twenty-second canon laid down rules for the solemnization of Matrimony ; and, on account of the great difference between the civil law of Scotland and that of England in regard to marriage, it permitted the clergy to dispense with those parts of the Marriage Service, in the Book of Common Prayer, which were not essential to the validity of the rite.

The twenty-third canon laid down rules in regard to the Visitation of the Sick, and the Burial of the Dead, and

allowed a discretionary use of the forms in the Prayer Book.

The twenty-fourth canon forbade notorious offenders to be admitted to the Communion ; the minister repelling such persons being required to intimate the cause to the bishop, and afterwards to obey his directions regarding them.

The twenty-fifth canon required the clergy to continue in their sacred profession.

The twenty-sixth and last canon declared what penalties were to be incurred by a breach of these canons. Bishops were to be censured, or dealt with by the other bishops, as these might judge the neglect or transgression required. Presbyters or deacons, for the first breach of obedience, were to be privately rebuked by the bishop of the diocese in which the offence was committed ; for repeated transgressions they were to be suspended *sine die* ; and, if they then appealed to the Episcopal Synod, and the judgment of the bishop was confirmed, they were to be deposed from the ministry and reduced to the station of laymen ; and, if they did not in that station behave properly, they were to be debarred from communion with the Church, till they gave proof of a sincere repentance. In regard to the penalty of deposition in the case thus mentioned, it seems to have been harsh and unjust to allow an appeal to the Episcopal College, but to punish the appellant, if unsuccessful, with such extreme severity, although he had committed no further offence.

Prefixed to the canons was an introduction drawn up by the Primus ; and appended to them were forms of letters-testimonial, and of other ecclesiastical writs. In the appendix was also inserted a " recommendation of a proper clerical habit," which shews the state of feeling prevalent at that time in regard to matters of ritual. It was as follows :— " Whereas it was represented to the Synod of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, holden at Aberdeen, in the year of our Lord 1811, that different dresses have of late been worn by the clergy officiating in this Church ; and whereas more importance seems to have been attached to the colour of the clerical vestments than can properly be ascribed to any colour, it is hereby declared, that it is not essential to the purity of public worship, whether the clergyman, when reading prayers, be arrayed in a white, or in a black vestment ; yet, as the white garment

was the proper sacerdotal vestment of the Jewish priesthood, and likewise of the Christian priesthood through the Universal Church for at least fourteen hundred years; as it is the proper sacerdotal vestment in the United Church of England and Ireland, with which the Episcopal Church in Scotland is in full communion; and as white seems to be a much more proper dress for the ministers of the Prince of peace and purity, than black, if propriety can be attached to any colour; the synod recommends to the several clergy of this Church to wear the surplice when publicly reading prayers, or administering the sacraments, but to introduce it with prudence and discretion, by explaining, where they find it necessary, the principles on which they have adopted the use of this very decent dress.”¹

Bishop Skinner died at Aberdeen, on the thirteenth of July, 1816, in the seventy-third year of his age. The recorded acts of his episcopate are the best proof of his merits. His learning and general acquirements were respectable; and, as an ecclesiastical ruler, he had practical knowledge and ability of a very high order. To him, more than to any other person, were the members of the Church indebted for those measures which raised their communion from the depressed state to which it had been long reduced, and prepared it for the new position it was called upon to take. He had seen the penal laws enforced in all their rigour; and, when a boy, he had been allowed, at his own request, to share the imprisonment to which his father was subjected for a transgression of those statutes. He was greatly indebted to his father's teaching, and, for many years after he was raised to the episcopate, was guided by his counsels and experience.²

On the twentieth of August, the members of the Episcopal College chose the Bishop of Brechin to fill the office of Primus. A mandate was also issued for the election of a bishop to the see of Aberdeen. The clergy met at Ellon, on the eleventh of September, and made choice of William Skinner, a presbyter in Aberdeen, and second son of the late bishop, who was consecrated at Stirling, on Sunday the

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 60-93. Skinner's Annals, p. 505-517. See also the canons, as printed at Aberdeen in 1811.

² Skinner's Annals, pp. 5, 26, 522.

twenty-seventh of October, by the Primus and the Bishops of Edinburgh, Dunkeld, and Murray.

Bishop William Skinner had been educated at Oxford, and ordained deacon and priest by Bishop Horsley, in consequence of his father's desire to shew his own personal conviction of the full communion which existed between the English and Scottish Churches. The slender income of the Primus would not have enabled him to send his son to an English university, had he not been assisted by the kindness of William Stevens. The circumstances connected with this matter are related by Sir James Allan Park, in his *Life of Stevens*; but no names are mentioned, and it would be difficult to find out, from the narrative, that the "respectable and exemplary clergyman residing in a very distant part of the kingdom . . . most desirous of getting his son educated at Oxford, intending him for holy orders," was Bishop John Skinner, and that the "young student" of Wadham College, to whom Stevens presented Parkhurst's two Lexicons, remarking that "with these two books, and his Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament well used, he might set up trade whenever called upon," was that bishop's son, and his successor, first in the see of Aberdeen, and afterwards in the primacy.¹

Bishop Macfarlane died on the twenty-sixth of July, 1819. David Low, a presbyter at Pittenweem, was elected by the unanimous voice of the clergy of Ross and Argyll, and was consecrated at Stirling, on Sunday the fourteenth of November, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Murray and Dunkeld. In the autumn of the same year, Bishop Sandford had proposed to resign the district of Fife, which he held along with the sees of Edinburgh and Glasgow, in the hope that the clergy would elect Mr. Low; but, in consequence of the appointment of the latter to Ross and Argyll, this design was abandoned.²

King George the Third died on the ninth of January, 1820, in the sixtieth year of his reign.

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 94. Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 36, 37. Stephen, vol. iv. p. 495. Park's *Life of Stevens*, p. 29-34. Churton's *Life of Joshua Watson*, vol. i. p. 36-38. See also a notice of Bishop William Skinner, in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* of May, 1857, written by the author of this work.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. i. p. 95. Blatch's *Life of Bishop Low*, pp. 9, 50, 52, 55, 56. *Edinburgh Annual Register*, vol. xii. p. 537.

CHAPTER LXXXIV.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING GEORGE II. IN OCTOBER, 1760, TO THE PASSING OF THE ACT OF ASSEMBLY RESPECTING UNQUALIFIED MINISTERS AND PREACHERS IN MAY, 1799.

Account of Dr. William Robertson and Dr. John Erskine—State of parties in the General Assembly—Discussion of the Overture on Schism—Ascendency of the moderate party—Proposed repeal of the penal laws against Roman Catholics—Popular excitement on the subject—Act of Assembly regarding persons applying for licence to preach or for ordination beyond the bounds of the Church—Dr. Robertson retires from the Assembly—Character of his ecclesiastical influence—Eminent members of the established Church at Aberdeen—Case of Dr. M^cGill of Ayr—Proceedings of the Seceders—Commemoration of the Revolution of 1688—The French Revolution of 1789—Act of Assembly prohibiting persons not licensed to preach or ordained by the established Church from holding benefices or preaching in Scotland.

DURING the first twenty years of the reign of King George the Third, Dr. William Robertson was the leader of the moderate party in the established Church. He was born in the year 1721, at Borthwick, in Mid-Lothian, of which parish his father was then minister. He received his education at the University of Edinburgh; and, in 1743, he was appointed minister of Gladsmuir. From his first appearance as a member of the general assembly, he supported the ecclesiastical principles with which his name was afterwards associated. He devoted, however, a considerable portion of his time to those literary pursuits in which he was so highly qualified to excel, and in 1759 his History of Scotland was published. While that work was in the press, he was presented to one of the churches in Edinburgh, and in 1762 was appointed principal

of the college there. It is unnecessary to allude to his other works, which procured for him a literary reputation, such as no Scotsman, with the exception of his friend David Hume, had hitherto enjoyed. That reputation strengthened his position as the leader of an ecclesiastical party; and the period, during which he guided the counsels of the assembly, was spoken of, with hardly any exaggeration of language, as that of his administration.

Dr. Robertson's colleague for many years in the charge of one of the churches of the capital was Dr. John Erskine, son of the distinguished Scottish lawyer of the same name, and grandson of Colonel Erskine of Carnock. Erskine maintained the hereditary principles of his family in ecclesiastical affairs, but, as an individual, lived in uninterrupted friendship with his colleague. He was respected as one of the most eminent of the popular party, but he never acquired such an influence as that which was exercised on the other side by Robertson. There can be no doubt that one main cause of the superiority, which the moderate party finally acquired, was the circumstance, that they were directed and kept together with consummate skill and ability.¹

For some time the two parties were nearly equally balanced, and the debates in the assembly were frequently animated and interesting. The ministers generally were far superior in point of education and ability to those who had been appointed to parochial benefices after the Revolution, and in the reign of Queen Anne, when it was found impossible to procure fit successors to the deprived Episcopal clergy. Among the laymen who sat in the assembly as ruling elders, were many persons of rank and station, and some who, like Dundas and Wedderburn, afterwards attained a high character for eloquence and ability in parliament.

The ascendancy which the moderate party had acquired in the end of the reign of George the Second, was shaken by the secession of several of their number in the beginning of the following reign. This has sometimes been attributed to personal motives, and to jealousy of the rising influence of Robertson;

¹ Life of Dr. Robertson by Dugald Stewart, prefixed to the twentieth edition of his History of Scotland, vol. i. pp. 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 14, 34. Moncreiff's Life of Dr. John Erskine, pp. 1, 265.

but, combined with these, there was a real and conscientious change of opinion. The following is the account given by Dr. Somerville, himself a steady adherent of the moderate party : —“ At the beginning of the present reign [that of George the Third], a marked alteration took place in the state of ecclesiastical parties, and a considerable number of the clergy, formerly enlisted with the moderates, began to give hints of a change of sentiment, and to approximate to the popular party, hitherto considered as their opponents. It were uncandid to withhold credit for conscientious principle from many individuals who deserted the ground on which they had formerly stood ; and, instead of uniform unqualified support of the right of patrons, expressed their doubts concerning the expediency of enforcing settlements in cases of a violent opposition to the presentee on the part of the parish. They themselves repudiated the charge of inconsistency. As good citizens, they considered it their bounden duty to support the law of the land, and, upon that principle solely, they had hitherto argued and voted in support of the right of patrons. But, having found no abatement in the aversion of the people against presentations, and that the pernicious effects of violent settlements had exceeded all foresight and calculation, particularly by multiplying the number and increasing the influence of dissenting sects, they now regarded it as their urgent duty to enquire if any expedient could be adopted for stemming the torrent of schism, and restoring the unity, the peace, and the dignity of the established Church.”¹

One of the most important occasions on which the two ecclesiastical parties came into collision, was in the general assembly of 1766. The following overture had been laid before the assembly of the preceding year : —“ As the progress of the schism in this Church is so very remarkable, and seems to be on the growing hand, as it is credibly affirmed that there are now one hundred and twenty meeting-houses erected, to which more than a hundred thousand persons resort, who were formerly of our communion, but have now separated themselves from the Church of Scotland, and that the effects of this schism begin to appear, and are likely to take root in the greatest and most populous towns ; it is hereby

¹ See Dr. Somerville's *Memoirs of his own Life and Times*, pp. 80, 81, 97, 98.

overtured, that the venerable assembly would take under their mature consideration this alarming evil, which hath so threatening an aspect to this Church, to the interests of religion, and to the peace of the country; and that they would provide such remedies against this schism, as in their great wisdom they shall judge most proper."

After a long debate, a committee had been appointed to consider the overture, and report to the next assembly. A report was accordingly presented to the assembly of 1766. It was to the following effect:—"In respect of the dangerous consequences that are to be apprehended from the increase of secession from the legal establishment of this Church, and as it is reported that no fewer than one hundred and twenty meeting-houses are already erected, although it never was nor is intended that any sort of severity should be used against any of those persons, it is overtured, that it may be recommended to presbyteries to enquire into the truth of this fact; and further, as the abuse of the right of patronage has been one chief occasion of the progress of secession, it is also overtured, that the general assembly would be pleased to consider what methods may be employed to remedy so great an evil; and it is humbly submitted, whether it may not be expedient, for this purpose, to appoint a committee to correspond with presbyteries, and gentlemen of property and influence, and to report."

A long debate took place on the thirtieth of May, which continued from ten in the morning to eleven at night. It was agreed, without a vote, to depart from that clause of the report which recommended an enquiry into the number of meeting-houses; but a division took place on the clause respecting the abuse of the right of patronage, and it was rejected by a majority of ninety-nine to eighty-five. Several members, who had formerly supported the moderate party, voted on this occasion with their opponents; and it was supposed that their conduct was influenced by the policy lately adopted by the Rockingham administration, which professed to consult the wishes of the people in the disposal of the ecclesiastical patronage of the crown. In the course of the debate, Dr. Robertson alluded in the following manner to those persons:—"I see many gentlemen here, Moderator, who

have always uniformly differed from me as to the expediency of public measures ; these I regard and esteem as honest men, because they are consistent. But when I see men at one time promoting one set of measures, and at another espousing the opposite, perhaps as one ministry or another prevails at court, I must heartily despise such dishonourable truckling." It is evident that the two parties were so nearly balanced, that the popular side would again have acquired the ascendancy, if the support of the government had been long withdrawn from the other party.¹

After these transactions, the supremacy of the moderate side became established, and continued to be undisturbed for many years. Presentations by patrons were sustained, unless other objections were brought forward than mere reluctance on the part of the people. Scenes of violence sometimes took place in settling an unpopular minister, but the details of such cases have often been exaggerated. More real scandal was given, and injury done, by the manner in which charges of personal immorality against ministers were frequently met in the church courts ; such complaints being sometimes disregarded, and, on other occasions, baffled by tedious and expensive legal proceedings.

In the year 1779, the Scottish nation was alarmed by a proposal to repeal the penal laws against the Roman Catholics. The members of the Church of Rome were exposed to legal disabilities and direct penalties much more severe than those which oppressed the Episcopal Church ; and the laws had sometimes been strictly enforced. The mild policy of the government of George the Third discouraged all active persecution, and the nation acquiesced in the propriety of such a course ; but the popular feeling was not yet prepared for an abolition, or even for an express mitigation, of the penal statutes. An act had been passed, which repealed some of the most cruel and unjust of these statutes. The provisions of this act did not extend to Scotland ; and, when it was proposed to bring in a similar bill for that country, the common people were greatly excited. Various outrages were committed in Edinburgh and Glasgow ; and, in the belief that Dr. Robertson was a chief

¹ Morren's *Annals of the General Assembly*, vol. ii. pp. vi. vii. 305-308, 311, 329-347. Somerville's *Life and Times*, p. 83-86.

mover in the measure of repeal, the mob threatened to attack his house, and were only prevented by a military force from carrying their design into execution. In consequence of the general opposition, the relief bill was withdrawn.

At the next general assembly, that of May, 1779, Dr. Robertson explained and vindicated his conduct in connection with the proposed repeal of the penal laws, in a speech which reflected the highest honour on his liberality and good sense. He declared his entire approbation of the English statute, and his wish at first that its benefits might be extended to Scotland; but he explained that his opinion as to the expediency of such a measure was altered, when he saw how strongly the national feeling was excited, and that, in consequence, he had himself advised the government to withdraw it.

While the most able and distinguished of the Presbyterian ministers thus incurred some danger by endeavouring to obtain a repeal of the laws against the Roman Catholics, Dr. Abernethy Drummond, afterwards Bishop of Edinburgh, had exerted himself in the opposite direction. He possessed considerable influence from his position in society, being the descendant of an old Scottish family, and married to the heiress of Hawthornden. Although in his youth he is said to have paid his respects to Prince Charles at Holyrood, he was strongly opposed to the principles of the Church of Rome, and was frequently engaged in controversy with the members of that communion. He sometimes allowed his polemical feelings to carry him too far; and it is asserted that his writings first stirred up the fanaticism of the common people, in opposition to a repeal of the penal statutes against the Roman Catholics.

In the general assembly of 1779, an important act was passed in regard to persons going beyond the bounds of the Church, in order to be licensed or ordained. It was to the following effect:—"The general assembly, upon the report of their committee for overtures, finding that a considerable majority of the presbyteries of this Church have now agreed to an overture anent persons going to be licensed and ordained without the bounds of this Church, did thereupon agree, without a vote, to turn the said overture into a standing act; and accordingly the general assembly did, and hereby do, enact

and prohibit all persons educated or residing within the bounds of this Church, from going out of its bounds to obtain licenses to preach ; and prohibit all preachers licensed by this Church from going without its bounds to obtain ordination, unless they are called to a particular congregation in another country ; and enact that licenses obtained in that manner shall not be received or have any effect in this Church ; and such preachers as contravene this act shall forfeit the license formerly given them, and be no longer entitled to the privileges which belong to a preacher of the Gospel in this Church."

Prior to this act, licenses to preach, and ordination, obtained in other Presbyterian communions, had frequently been sustained in appointments to parochial charges in Scotland. These were no longer sufficient in the case of persons educated or residing within the jurisdiction of the assembly.¹

The general assembly of the following year was the last which Dr. Robertson attended. While his health was still unbroken, and his influence unimpaired, he wished to retire from the scene of his ecclesiastical contests. It is said that the cause of this resolution was the dread he entertained of some measures which the more violent members of his own party wished to bring forward, particularly a proposal

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 803. Stewart's Life of Dr. Robertson, p. 122-129. Moncreiff's Life of Dr. John Erskine, p. 284-294. Dr Robertson's speech in connection with the repeal of the penal laws against Roman Catholics is inserted at length in the Scots Magazine, vol. xli. p. 409-415. Referring to the proposed repeal, Dr. Somerville observes (Life and Times, pp. 192, 193), "It is a curious fact that the first alarm of the intended indulgence in their behalf, and its portentous danger, was proclaimed by a Nonjuring bishop, at the head of a sect that had always been considered as the least disaffected to the Roman Catholics, or rather, since the Revolution of 1688, as their secret friends ; nor was it less extraordinary that persons who adhered to the most rigid form of the Presbyterian faith and discipline, should have coalesced with a party hitherto the objects of their detestation and jealousy hardly less than declared Papists. I have no doubt but that the bigotry of individuals, independent of any extraneous influence, would have been sufficient to instigate that tumultuary outrage which was soon productive of the most scandalous and mischievous effects in both nations ; but, at the same time, it is certain that the letters of Bishop Abernethy gave the signal for the explosion of the fanatical frenzy which quickly broke out in every town and parish in Scotland." When he wrote this passage, Dr. Somerville had forgotten that Dr. Abernethy Drummond was not raised to the episcopate till several years after the circumstances referred to.

to abolish subscription to the Confession of Faith. Dr. Robertson survived till the eleventh of June, 1793. The following passage from the funeral sermon preached by his colleague, Dr. Erskine, explains the character of his influence in the assembly:—"His speeches in church courts were admired by those whom they did not convince, and acquired and preserved him an influence over a majority in them, which none before him enjoyed; though his measures were sometimes new, and warmly, and with great strength of argument, opposed both from the press, and in the general assembly. To this influence many causes contributed—his firm adherence to the general principles of church policy which he early adopted; his sagacity in forming plans; his steadiness in executing them; his quick discernment of whatever might hinder or promote his designs; his boldness in encountering difficulties; his presence of mind in improving every occasional advantage; the address with which, when he saw it necessary, he could make an honourable retreat; and his skill in stating a vote, and seizing the favourable moment for ending a debate, and urging a decision. He guided and governed others without seeming to assume any superiority over them, and fixed and strengthened his power, by often, in matters of form and expediency, preferring the opinions of those with whom he acted to his own. In former times, hardly any rose up to speak in the general assembly, till called upon by the moderator, unless men advanced in years, of high rank, or of established character. His example and influence encouraged young men of abilities to take their share of public business, and thus deprived moderators of an engine for preventing causes being fairly and impartially discussed. The power of others, who formerly had in some measure guided ecclesiastical affairs, was derived from ministers of state, and expired with their fall. His remained unhurt amidst frequent changes of administration. Great men in office were always ready to countenance him, to co-operate with him, and to avail themselves of his aid. But he judged for himself, and scorned to be their slave, or to submit to receive their instructions. Hence, his influence, not confined to men of mercenary views, extended to many of a free and independent spirit, who supported, because they approved, his measures, which others, from the

same independent spirit, thought it their duty steadily to oppose."¹

While the meetings of the assembly were swayed by the ability, and adorned by the eloquence of Robertson, the Presbyterian Church in Aberdeen numbered among its members several divines and men of letters, not unworthy to be compared with the great scholars who maintained the cause of Episcopacy in that city during the reign of Charles the First. Foremost among them was Dr. George Campbell, for some time minister at Banchory-Ternan, afterwards Principal of Marischal College. His greatest work was his Dissertation on Miracles, in which the sceptical arguments of Hume were refuted. Dr. Alexander Gerard, Professor of Divinity, first at Marischal College, and afterwards at King's College, like Dr. Campbell, was distinguished both for his theological and for his literary attainments. But the best known beyond Scotland was Dr. James Beattie, Professor of Moral Philosophy at Marischal College. Dr. Gerard died in 1795, and Dr. Campbell in the following year; Dr. Beattie survived till 1803. The last mentioned writer differed from his friends in preferring the government and ritual of the Church of England to those of his own communion, to which indeed, not being a minister, he was not so strictly bound as the others. But, although on more than one occasion he was requested to take holy orders, and accept a benefice in the English Church, he declined the proposals.²

The fears entertained by Dr. Robertson of some attempt to subvert the authority of the established formularies were probably not without foundation, although the danger was averted. Many ministers hardly concealed their dislike to Calvinistic opinions; and some of them, though, so far as appears, only a small number, had become infected with Arian or Socinian

¹ Stewart's Life of Dr. Robertson, pp. 129-131, 140, and appendix, pp. 199, 200.

² The best account of the state of learning at Aberdeen in the latter half of the eighteenth century is to be found in Sir William Forbes's Life of Dr. Beattie. See also Mr. Cunningham's Church History, vol. ii. p. 515-522. As to Dr. Campbell's character as a speaker in the general assembly, see Somerville's Life and Times, pp. 95, 96. Dr. Thomas Reid is frequently mentioned in connection with the distinguished persons referred to in the text; but he left Aberdeen for Glasgow only three years after Dr. Beattie was appointed to his professorship.

errors. One of the latter class, Dr. M'Gill, minister at Ayr, published a book in 1786, in which he denied, at least by implication, the doctrine of the Atonement. Two years afterwards, he published another work, which contained arguments against the expediency of creeds and confessions. No notice of the first work was taken by the ecclesiastical courts; but, on the appearance of the second, a formal charge of heresy, in connection with both works, was brought against the author. When the case came before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, Dr. M'Gill made an apology for any erroneous or unguarded expressions which he might have used, and declared his readiness to conform to the standards of the Church. With this the synod was satisfied, and a formal thanksgiving for this conclusion of the proceedings was offered, in name of the court, by Dr. M'Gill's colleague, Mr. Dalrymple, who was supposed to share his opinions. The popular feeling in the west of Scotland was much divided on this matter. In those districts which had once been the chief seat of the Covenanters, many persons had embraced latitudinarian or Socinian opinions, and openly triumphed in the result. The adherents of Calvinism, however, were still numerous and powerful, and made an effort to obtain another hearing before the ecclesiastical courts on the subject of Dr. M'Gill's writings; but their complaint was rejected as irregular in point of form.¹

Both branches of the Seceders watched these proceedings with much interest. The Burgher Synod published a "Warning against Socinianism," in order to guard their people against Dr. M'Gill's errors. The Synod of Glasgow, one of the four provincial synods, under which the congregations connected with the Antiburgher Synod were now classified, agreed to an overture on the same subject. This document, while it reflected severely on the ecclesiastical courts of the establishment, contained passages which marked an important change of opinion among the Seceders themselves. "The ministers of the national Church," it was stated, "are not only divided about ecclesiastical management, and other questions of mere doubtful disputation, but about the most fundamental articles of the revealed religion. Now, our Lord Jesus Christ has declared, that a house or kingdom divided

¹ M'Kerrow, p. 359-369. Scots Magazine, vol. liii. p. 302.

against itself cannot stand ; and in fact there is properly no bond of union among them except the civil establishment. Were this old rusty hoop knocked off they would fly into ten or twenty pieces. . . . It is more than time that the people of this country were falling upon more resolute and regular methods of having this antichristian yoke [patronage] dashed in pieces. They should resolve to let every intruder instruct his proper audience, the pews, walls, bells, and steeples, with his honourable or right honourable patron ; and they should persist in an orderly and peaceable, but firm and determined application to parliament every year, till they get either this legal and oppressive tyranny abolished, or the public funds applied for the support of one in each parish, to whose ministration they can with a safe conscience submit, in proportion to their real numbers ; or, what is perhaps the only effectual way of being quit of this cruel usurpation, let the public fund be applied to other useful purposes, and let every one pay his own minister, as he does his lawyer or physician."

The historian of the Secession Church, referring to these statements, observes : "They shew us that the doctrine of civil establishments in religion was not much more in repute half a century ago, in at least one section of the Secession, than it is now ; and the charge brought against the present race of Seceders, that the sentiments entertained by a large portion of them, unfavourable to civil establishments, are new, is unfounded." The remark is just ; but the views thus promulgated in the end of the eighteenth century were entirely opposed to those of the Erskines, and of the other founders of the Secession.¹

The year 1788 is referred to in the records of the assembly, as "the secular anniversary" of "the happy and glorious event, that in the year 1688 delivered the nation from civil and religious oppression." Both the established Church and the Burgher Seceders agreed to observe the fifth of November in that year as a day of solemn thanksgiving for the Revolution.²

The commemoration of an event, to which all Presbyterians

¹ M'Kerrow, p. 369-371.

² Acts of Assembly, p. 829. M'Kerrow, p. 566-568.

naturally looked back with feelings of thankfulness, was soon followed by a revolution in France which most of them regarded in a very different light. The general assembly of the established Church strenuously supported the government in the measures which it took for the suppression of anarchy and rebellion; and the Seceding judicatories, while they discouraged formal declarations by their people on the subject, maintained the duty of fidelity to the constitution, and of allegiance to the sovereign.

In the assembly of 1799, a declaratory act was passed, which enacted and declared, "That it is agreeable to the constitution, the laws, and the decisions of this Church, that no probationer, who has obtained a license without the bounds of this Church, or who has not obtained a license from some presbytery of this Church, and no ordained person, who did not obtain his license from a presbytery of this Church, or who, either by going without the bounds of the Church to obtain ordination, although he was not called to a particular congregation in another country, or by any other part of his conduct, has forfeited the license which he had obtained, shall be held qualified to accept of a presentation or a call to any parish in this Church, or to any chapel of ease connected therewith. And the general assembly do hereby enjoin all the presbyteries of this Church, if a presentation or a call to any such probationer or ordained person, as is described in this act, shall at any time be given in to them, instantly to pronounce a sentence refusing to sustain such presentation or call, and declaring it null and void."

This act also contained the following provision:—"And further, the general assembly, considering that it is of the greatest importance to the interests of true religion, to the sound instruction of the people, to the quiet of their minds, and the peace of the Church and State, that unqualified persons, who intrude themselves into the ministry of the word, shall not receive any countenance from the ministers of this Church, more especially in the present times, when men, who avow their hostility to our ecclesiastical establishment, and their contempt of all the rules which the wisdom of our ancestors framed upon the model of Scripture for the orderly dispensation of the word and sacraments, are traversing all the

districts within the bounds of this Church, and attempting to alienate the minds of the people from their established teachers ; considering also that it is essential to the unity and good order of the Church, and implied in the fundamental principles of Presbyterian government, that no minister shall presume to set up his individual judgment in opposition to the judgment of those to whom, at his ordination, he promised subjection in the Lord ; and that every minister shall consider himself as answerable to his presbytery for the manner in which all the parts of divine service are performed during his incumbency, within the stated place of worship provided by law for that congregation which is committed to his care ; do hereby discharge and prohibit, under pain of such censures as the judicatories of this Church may see cause to inflict, all the ministers of this Church, and the ministers of all chapels of ease connected therewith, from employing to preach upon any occasion, or to dispense any of the other ordinances of the Gospel, within any congregation under the jurisdiction of this Church, persons who are not qualified according to the laws of this Church to accept of a presentation, and from holding ministerial communion in any other manner with such persons."

By the former part of this act, the provisions of the act of 1779 were extended to all persons who had not obtained a license from a presbytery of the established Church. By the latter part, the ministers of the established Church were prohibited from holding ministerial communion in any way with persons not qualified to accept a presentation to a parochial charge. This measure received the strenuous support of Dr. George Hill, Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, who had succeeded, though with inferior influence and ability, to the leadership of the moderate party formerly held by Dr. Robertson. His biographer mentions that the declaratory act was thought requisite, in consequence of the discussions which had taken place in the assembly in connection with two cases, in which presentations had been granted to preachers who had not received their education at a university, as required by the Church, and had been licensed by Presbyterian Dissenters in England.

This will explain the first part of the act ; but the second

part seems to have little relation to such cases. One writer states that the enactment was occasioned by the proceedings of Rowland Hill; and that such men as he, and Mr. Simeon of Cambridge, were expressly aimed at by the moderate party, "not because they were Episcopalians, but because their doctrine was evangelical." These two English clergymen had recently visited Scotland, and preached in various places. Hill had published an account of his tour, in which he made severe remarks on the conduct of the various religious bodies—on both branches of the Secession, on the Cameronians, on the Episcopalians, and especially on the moderate party in the establishment. There can be no doubt that the moderate ministers were displeased with the conduct of the two English clergymen; but they were still more irritated by the violent and reckless language of some lay preachers, who denounced indiscriminately all who did not teach what they themselves called the Gospel; and it was against this revival of Independent opinions and practices that the preamble to the act of assembly was chiefly directed.

Two papers were issued by the same assembly, which clearly pointed at the itinerant lay preachers. One of these was a pastoral admonition addressed to the members of the establishment. It alluded to persons who "assume the character of missionaries," and declare that "every man has a right to preach the Gospel," and who were "now traversing the whole country as evangelists, without any sort of authority, without giving any public pledge for the soundness of their faith, or the correctness of their morals, and without those advantages of regular education, and of preparatory knowledge, which, under every form of a Christian Church ever since the age of miraculous gifts, have been held as indispensably necessary for the useful and successful discharge of a Gospel ministry."

Whatever provocation the establishment may have received, the latter part of the declaratory act, which has been quoted, was framed with needless strictness. It virtually prohibited the parochial incumbents from holding ecclesiastical communion in Scotland with ministers of other Presbyterian bodies. And thus, by a voluntary act of its own, the Church put its ministers in a position as isolated, as that

which was imposed upon the English clergy by a law of the state.¹

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 868-875. Cook's Life of Dr. Hill, p. 171-175. Hetherington's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 699-702. Haldane's Memoirs of the Lives of Robert Haldane, and James Alexander Haldane, ed. 1852, p. 225-227.

CHAPTER LXXXV.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

FROM THE PASSING OF THE ACT OF ASSEMBLY RESPECTING UNQUALIFIED
MINISTERS AND PREACHERS IN MAY, 1799, TO THE DEATH OF KING
GEORGE IV. IN JUNE, 1830.

Increasing influence of the popular party in the established Church—Question as to Pluralities—The Leslie Controversy—Renewed attempt to obtain an augmentation of the ministers' stipends—Speech of Dr. Carlyle—Communication from the Synod of Ulster—Dispute as to Prayers for the Royal Family—Mission to the East Indies—Proceedings in the Secession Church—Changes of opinion among the Seceders—New Testimony adopted by the Antiburgher Synod—Deposition of Mr M'Crie and other members—Formation of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery—Overture laid before the Burgher Synod—Formation of the Associate Presbytery—Proposal to unite the Burgher and Antiburgher Synods—Basis of Union adopted—Ratification of the Union—Formation of the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church—Progress of Congregationalism in Scotland—Robert and James Haldane—The Haldanes join the Baptist communion—Formation of the Congregational Union of Scotland.

THE history of the established Church for the last twenty years of George the Third, and during the reign of his successor, presents few objects of interest. The ascendancy of the moderate party continued to prevail, though various circumstances occurred which shewed that it was less secure than before. The unity and vigour which, under the sway of Dr. Robertson, had governed its counsels, were considerably impaired. This was owing, in a great measure, to the inferior ability of Dr. Hill, and to his residence at St. Andrews, which prevented him from holding free and constant communication with the Edinburgh ministers, on whom the chief

management of ecclesiastical business naturally devolved. Dr. Hill died in December, 1819. After his death there was no recognized leader of the moderate party ; but it ranked among its members several able men, the most distinguished of whom were Dr. John Inglis, of Edinburgh, and Dr. George Cook, the ecclesiastical historian.

The popular party was slowly regaining strength. In the assembly, it was led by Sir Henry Moncreiff, and Dr. Andrew Thomson ; but it was chiefly through the press that the old reforming spirit again became a living influence. In this way also Dr. Thomson was among its most active supporters. In the year 1810, soon after his appointment to one of the churches of the capital, he commenced the publication of the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, a periodical work which became the recognized organ of his party. Yet more effectual in the same cause were the writings of Dr. Thomas M'Crie, himself a minister of the most rigid branch of the Secession. The *Life of Knox* was published in 1811, and after some time made a strong impression on the national mind of Scotland. The learning and genius which it displayed conciliated the respect of men of letters of all opinions, and induced many to overlook the partiality of its statements, and the erroneous nature of some of the principles which it advocated. This work gradually effected a great change in the popular estimate of Knox and the reformers of the sixteenth century. If there had formerly been a tendency to depreciate their character, an opposite extreme now became fashionable. Not only were their real services acknowledged ; their very excesses were held up as an example instead of a warning.

The proceedings of the general assembly do not call for minute notice. The contests between the two parties, though occasionally of an exciting character at the time, seldom involved matters of permanent interest.

In 1805, their strength was tried on a question which indirectly involved the expediency of allowing parochial ministers to hold appointments in addition to their pastoral office. The theory of Presbyterianism was entirely opposed to a plurality of benefices ; and, except at those times when a union of parochial charges was rendered necessary by a deficiency in the number of persons qualified to fill them, the

practice had been in conformity with the theory. There was, however, one special case which had not been provided for—that of a professorship in a university. It was supposed that the same person might lawfully and adequately discharge the duty both of a parochial minister and of a professor, where non-residence in his parish was not thereby rendered necessary ; and accordingly Dr. Robertson and many others had held such a union of offices.

On this subject, the popular party maintained the strict theory of their Church, and denounced pluralities as wrong under any circumstances. The moderate party had no scruples on the point ; and, as the patronage in the universities was generally exercised in their favour, they had personal reasons for maintaining what was now an established practice.

The professorship of mathematics in the University of Edinburgh having become vacant in 1805, the moderate ministers in that city exerted all their influence to obtain the office for Mr. Thomas Macknight, one of their own number. Among the candidates was Mr. John Leslie, whose scientific attainments were undoubtedly far superior to those of any of his rivals ; and he was nominated to the chair by the patrons, the town council. Irritated by their disappointment, the moderate ministers of Edinburgh ungenerously and unwisely endeavoured to exclude Mr. Leslie, by objecting to his religious opinions on account of language which he had used regarding the philosophical tenets of Hume. He denied the heterodox meaning imputed ; but his opponents brought the whole matter before the Presbytery of Edinburgh, with a request to them, “to take such steps as should, in their wisdom, seem most agreeable to the civil and religious institutions of that part of the kingdom.” This proposal was resisted in the presbytery as incompetent ; but it was agreed to by a majority of fourteen to thirteen. The minority brought the case before the Synod of Lothian, by whom it was referred to the next general assembly.

In the assembly a discussion took place which was continued for two days. The opposing parties—so far as the question of religious belief was concerned—seemed to have changed sides ; the moderate party insisting on a jealous maintenance of orthodox principles, and their rivals contending for freedom

of opinion. Mr. Francis Horner remarked at the time: "If the denominations of faction were to be still retained, after the conduct to which they applied seems obliterated, we should have to tell, that the cause of genuine philosophy was defended by the fanatics, while the flames of persecution were kindling by the moderates." Mr. Leslie was also supported by the whole influence of the political party to which he belonged; and among those who spoke in his favour were the Earl of Lauderdale, Henry Erskine, Malcolm Laing, and Dugald Stewart. On a vote being taken, the assembly, by a majority of ninety-six to eighty-four, decided against the competency of interfering.¹

The ministers of the established Church had for many years attempted to obtain an addition to their slender endowments, but their efforts had been unsuccessful, chiefly in consequence of the opposition of the nobility and gentry, who held the tithes as part of their estates subject to the claims of the parochial incumbents. An account was formerly given of the attempt made in 1749 to procure an augmentation. The proposal was renewed forty years afterwards, and was strenuously supported by all parties in the assembly. On that occasion the poverty of the Church was referred to by many; but Dr. Carlyle claimed what was asked as a matter of justice, and repudiated the mere language of supplication. "I must confess," he said, "that I do not love to hear this Church called a poor Church, or the poorest Church in Christendom. I doubt very much that, if it were minutely enquired into, this is really the fact. But, independent of that, I dislike the language of whining and complaint. We are rich in the best goods a Church can have—the learning, the manners, and the character of its members. There are few branches of literature in which the ministers of this Church have not ex-

¹ In regard to what was called the Leslie Controversy, see Mr. Dugald Stewart's "Short Statement of some important facts relative to the late election of a Mathematical Professor in the University of Edinburgh;" Dr. John Inglis's Examination of Mr. Stewart's Statement; Mr. Playfair's Letter to the author of the Examination; Dr. Inglis's Reply to Mr. Playfair's Letter; Report of the proceedings and debate in the General Assembly, published at the time; *Scots Magazine*, vol. lxvii. pp. 234, 321-324, 400-403; Mr. Francis Horner's article in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. vii. p. 113-134; Lord Cockburn's Memorials, p. 200-211; and Mr. Cunningham's Church History, vol. ii. p. 600-604.

celled. There are few subjects of fine writing in which they do not stand foremost in the rank of authors, which is a prouder boast than all the pomp of the hierarchy. We have men who have successfully enlightened the world in almost every branch, not to mention treatises in defence of Christianity, or eloquent illustrations of every branch of Christian doctrine and morals. Who have written the best histories, ancient and modern? It has been clergymen of this Church. Who has written the clearest delineation of the human understanding and all its powers? A clergyman of this Church. Who has written the best system of rhetoric, and exemplified it by his own orations? A clergyman of this Church. Who wrote a tragedy that has been deemed perfect? A clergyman of this Church. Who was the most profound mathematician of the age he lived in? A clergyman of this Church. Who is his successor in reputation as in office? Who wrote the best treatise on agriculture? Let us not complain of poverty, for it is a splendid poverty indeed! It is *paupertas foecunda virorum*."

The arguments and the eloquence of the ministers were of no avail. A bill for the augmentation of stipends was brought into parliament by the government, but the landholders again resisted, and it was abandoned. Finally, however, in the year 1810, a measure was carried through the legislature, by which the stipend of each parish minister was raised to one hundred and fifty pounds a year at the least, in addition to his manse and glebe; the sum required for the purpose being taken, not from the tithes, but from the general revenue of the kingdom.¹

In 1816, an attempt was made to modify the strict provisions of the act of 1799. The Presbyterians of Ulster had expressed a desire to be admitted to closer ecclesiastical communion with the Scottish establishment. A committee was appointed to consider the matter, and presented the following report:—"The committee on the communication from the moderator of the Synod of Ulster, having deliberately considered said communication, report to the venerable assembly the following opinion:—That from the respectable situation in

¹ Autobiography of Dr. Carlyle, p. 559-562. Cunningham's Church History, vol. ii. p. 608-610.

which the Synod of Ulster is now placed by its connection with the civil government, it may be expedient to declare that, notwithstanding what is contained in the act of assembly, 1799, ministerial communion might be allowed between the ministers and licentiates of that Synod and those of the Church of Scotland. But as information respecting the education of their candidates for licenses and other particulars must be obtained before any resolution on this subject be finally adopted, that therefore the matter should be delayed; and in the meantime a committee be appointed to make the proper inquiries, to correspond with the moderator of the Synod of Ulster, and to report to next assembly. In testimony of the respect which this Church entertains for the established Presbyterian Church of Ireland, the assembly should request of their moderator, that he, in their name, would convey by letter notice of their present resolution to the moderator of the Synod of Ulster."

This report received the unanimous approbation of the assembly, but it does not appear what farther took place.¹

In the first assembly after the accession of King George the Fourth, attention was drawn to an order of the privy council regarding the prayers to be publicly offered up for the king and the royal family, which had been transmitted to the moderator of last assembly. The order was as follows :—"In pursuance of an act passed in the tenth year of her late majesty Queen Anne, and of another act passed in the thirty-second year of his late majesty King George the Third, wherein provision is made for praying for the royal family in that part of Great Britain called Scotland, it is ordered by his majesty in council, that henceforth every minister and preacher shall, in his respective church, congregation, or assembly, pray in express words for his most sacred majesty King George, and all the royal family; of which all persons concerned are hereby required to take notice and govern themselves accordingly." The first of the acts mentioned in the order was the Toleration Act of Queen Anne, which referred chiefly to the Episcopal Church, but which also enjoined the ministers of the established Church, as well as the Episcopal clergy, to pray for the sovereign and the royal family. The second act mentioned

¹ Acts of Assembly, pp. 951, 952.

was the statute which repealed the penal laws against the Episcopal communion, and which had no reference whatever to the ministers of the established Church. It appears, however, to have been the practice of the privy council, to transmit such orders to the ministers of the established Church through the moderator of the general assembly, and to the clergy of the Episcopal Church through the bishops. There was certainly no intention on the part of the government to interfere in any way with the privileges of the establishment, and no such jealousy of its proceedings had been shewn on former occasions. A discussion took place on the point, and two motions were made. The first, which was moved by Dr. Andrew Thomson, and seconded by one of the lay-elders, Mr. James Moncreiff, son of Sir Henry Moncreiff, was, "That it be declared by the general assembly that no civil authority can constitutionally prescribe either forms or heads of prayer to the ministers and preachers of this Church; and that the orders in council, which have been issued from time to time respecting prayers for the royal family, are inconsistent with the rights and privileges secured by law to our ecclesiastical establishment; but that, as these orders appear to have originated in mistake or inadvertence, and not in any intention to interfere with our modes of worship, the general assembly do not consider it to be necessary to proceed farther in this matter at present. And the general assembly embrace this opportunity of declaring the cordial and steady attachment of the Church of Scotland to their most gracious sovereign, and to all the royal family; and of further expressing their unqualified confidence that, actuated by the same principles of loyalty and religion which have hitherto guided them, her ministers and preachers will never cease to offer up, along with their people, their fervent supplications to Almighty God in behalf of a family, to whom, under providence, we are indebted for so many distinguished blessings, both sacred and civil." The other motion was, "That whereas the independence of the Church of Scotland, in all matters of faith, worship, and discipline, is fully established by law, the general assembly finds it unnecessary and inexpedient to adopt any declaration with regard to the late, or any former, orders in council, relative to prayer for his majesty and the royal

family." The second motion was carried by a majority of one hundred and twenty-six to fifty-three; but the debate shewed that the members in the minority were ready to avow their principles and maintain them to the utmost, while those in the majority seemed rather to apologise for the course which they adopted, than to defend it.

This discussion was indicative of the jealousy with which the popular party now watched any attempt of the secular authority to interfere with the worship of the established Church; but it was also connected with mere political feelings, and with the opposition, then gaining ground in Scotland, to the measures of the sovereign and his administration.¹

In the year 1817, the majority in the general assembly had endeavoured to settle the question of pluralities by an act, which prohibited parish ministers from holding professorships in universities, except in cases where their pastoral charge was within the university city or its suburbs. The opponents of pluralities were not, however, satisfied with this. They afterwards made repeated attempts to obtain the entire abolition of such a union of offices under any circumstances whatever; but, though their influence was increasing, they were unable to attain their object.²

The Presbyterian Church had hitherto devoted little attention to the conversion of the Heathen, and its negligence in this respect had been owing in part to its position as the religious establishment of Scotland only, not of the British empire. During the reign of George the Fourth, several good men, both on the moderate and on the popular side, became convinced that no Christian society could rightly overlook so important a duty. A mission to the East Indies was begun, and the first missionary selected was Dr. Alexander Duff, a minister admirably qualified for the difficult task which he undertook.

At the death of George the Fourth on the twenty-sixth of June, 1830, the established Church was apparently peaceful and secure; and the two parties, into which it was divided,

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 979. Scots Magazine, vol. lxxxv. p. 572. Edinburgh Christian Instructor, vol. xix. p. 368-396.

² Acts of Assembly, p. 959. Cunningham's Church History, vol. ii. p. 613-615.

seemed more disposed than at any former period to forget the points on which they differed, and to unite in the promotion of common religious objects.

It will now be proper to revert to the history of the Secession Church. The division of that communion into two branches, popularly known as the Antiburgher and the Burgher Synod, seemed to increase the zeal and activity of its members. Both synods became so formidable as to excite the fears of the established Church; and, as already mentioned, overtures on the subject were made to the general assembly. Their influence was not confined to Scotland; numerous congregations in connection with them existed in Ireland and North America.

Before the end of the eighteenth century, a gradual change of opinion had taken place among the Seceders, regarding the authority of the state in matters ecclesiastical. Reference was formerly made to a document issued by a portion of the Antiburgher Synod, the language of which clearly marked this alteration; and the progress of the new opinions, and of the divisions to which they gave rise, may first be related in connection with that branch of the Secession.

Those ministers and members of the Antiburgher Synod, whose views were changed or modified in regard to the authority of the civil magistrate in matters of religion, were desirous of effecting such alterations in the authorised formularies of their communion as would suit the circumstances of the time. Many meetings were held, and committees were appointed to revise the formularies; and, after the labour of several years, the revisal of the various documents was completed.

The principal changes were embodied in a new Testimony, which was formally sanctioned by the Synod, in May, 1804. The adoption of that document was agreed to by a great majority, but several ministers dissented, among whom was Mr. M'Crie.

The revisers of the formularies made the following declaration of the principle on which they had carried out their work:—"The foundation upon which we rest the whole of our ecclesiastical constitution is the testimony of God in his word. That main pillar of the Reformation, 'That the Bible contains the whole religion of Protestants,' we adopt for our

fundamental principle, and build upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone. Though we should be defamed as setting up the reformation attained to betwixt the years 1638 and 1650 as the standard of our church state, we hold every thought of this kind in detestation. We acknowledge *that* to have been a period of eminent ecclesiastical purity; but we call no man, nor Church, master. One is our Master, even Christ, and his word is our only unerring rule. 'To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.' "

In regard to what were known among them as the first and second reformatiions, the one from Popery, the other from Prelacy, they said: "Our declaring an adherence to these reformatiions, and particularly to the latter, as comprehending in it all the valuable attainments of the former, does not imply our approbation of all the measures adopted in the prosecution of either. Some of the measures that have been adopted in the prosecution of the last, that have been considered by many as most exceptionable, we do not hesitate to approve; such as their meeting together to concert measures for getting rid of public evils, even when their meetings for that purpose were forbidden by orders from court; their defending themselves by arms when unjustly attacked by their enemies; their pledging themselves to cleave to one another in the prosecution of the cause in which they were engaged, and using means for securing to themselves the quiet possession of their Christian privileges. We do not vindicate the embodying the matter of their religious profession with the laws of the country, and giving it the formal sanction of civil authority. It is not, however, to the imperfect managements of men that we declare our adherence, but to the reformation itself."

In reference to the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism, they observed: "In our adherence to them, we are not to be viewed as adopting a rule of faith distinct from the Holy Scriptures. Though we acknowledge these as subordinate standards, they are not at all the rule of what we are bound to believe, but a public declaration of what we do believe, and believe because revealed to us in the word of God. By this word they are themselves to be tried and judged.

The reason why we use them, and avow our adherence to them, is, that we may give public testimony of our soundness in the faith, and thereby distinguish ourselves from those who pervert the Scriptures, by glosses contrary to their genuine meaning." And they added: "As no human composure, however excellent and well expressed, can be supposed to contain a full and comprehensive view of divine truth, so, by this adherence, we are not precluded from embracing, upon due deliberation, any further light which may afterward arise from the word of God, about any article of divine truth."

In regard to the distinction between Church and State, they said: "The Church is a spiritual kingdom. Her members, as such, are considered as spiritual persons. The same character belongs to her doctrine, ordinances, and office-bearers. But the kingdoms of this world are secular and earthly societies, the members of which, as such, are considered as capable of performing the duties, and enjoying the privileges belonging to a civil state. The power of the Church is wholly spiritual, and is exercised by her office-bearers, in its whole extent, solely with respect to the spiritual interests of men, and in no other name but that of Christ. But the power competent to worldly kingdoms is wholly temporal, respecting only the temporal interests of society. Their rulers can have no spiritual power, because this cannot reside in a civil body, and therefore cannot be communicated to them by those who have entrusted them with power. The rulers of the Church are bound to publish and execute the laws given her by Christ, but have no right to make new laws, or in the least to deviate from his. But civil society may choose what form of government, and may make what civil laws, they please, if they do nothing contrary to the eternal law of righteousness, which is the rule of civil society as such. The glory of God in the salvation of elect sinners is the end of the erection of the Church, and of all her doctrines and ordinances. The end of civil government, in subordination to the divine glory, is the public and temporal good of civil society. Neither of these kingdoms hath power over the other. The Church hath a spiritual authority over such of the subjects and rulers of earthly kingdoms as are in her communion; and the civil powers have the same authority over the members and office-bearers of the Church as over the

rest of their subjects. But she hath no power over earthly kingdoms in their collective and civil capacity ; nor have they any power over her as a Church. Christ her Head, while on earth, disclaimed all exercise of civil authority ; and there is not the least evidence from the New Testament that He intrusted his servants with any. So far from this, it is given as the character of the Man of Sin, that he should arrogate authority over earthly kingdoms. On the other hand, neither these kingdoms, nor their sovereigns, have any power in or over the Church. Christ, her only Sovereign, hath neither directly nor indirectly, given them any spiritual authority. The Christian religion lays every one who professes it under the strongest obligations to the faithful discharge of the duties of his station. But it annexes no new powers to any office or relation founded in nature ; therefore Christian magistrates have no power to give laws to the Church, to appoint her office-bearers, or dictate to them in the discharge of their office, to prescribe a confession of faith, or form of worship to the Church, or their subjects in general, authoritatively to call meetings of Church judicatories in ordinary cases, or to direct and control them in their judicial procedure. In matters purely religious, civil rulers have no right to judge for any but themselves."

Mr. M'Crie and four other ministers, who refused to concur in these changes, withdrew from their brethren, and formed themselves into a separate body under the name of "The Constitutional Associate Presbytery." They were soon afterwards deposed by the Synod, and suspended from all communion "in sealing ordinances."

The historian of the Secession Church states that the Synod treated the dissenting brethren all along with great forbearance ; and, while he admits that the sentence of deposition was uncalled for and severe, he asserts that some ecclesiastical censure was necessary, unless every attempt to maintain church authority was to be given up. Even this modified vindication of the Synod is not satisfactory. The only offence of the minority was a steadfast adherence to those principles for which at one time the whole body contended.¹

In the Burgher Synod, also, doubts had arisen in connection

¹ M'Kerrow, p. 430-461. Life of Dr. M'Crie by his Son, p. 43-117.

with the ecclesiastical authority of the civil magistrate, and the obligation of literal adherence to the Confession of Faith and the Covenants. A committee was appointed by the Synod to prepare an overture in such terms as might command the assent of all parties. The overture was drawn up and laid before the Synod at its meeting in April, 1796. The most important part of it was in the following terms :—" The Associate Synod hereby declare their attachment to the doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, which were adopted by the general assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the years 1647 and 1648 ; at the same time hereby declaring that, although they wish to fear God and honour the king, and consider subjection to the powers that are as an important duty incumbent on all men, yet, as the power respecting religion ascribed to the civil magistrate in said Confession and Larger Catechism, as also in the National Covenant of Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant, has been, and still is, a matter of doubtful disputation among good and faithful men, the Synod no longer make it a term of ministerial and Christian communion, but will exercise forbearance with brethren, whatever their sentiments be on that article."

There was much difference of opinion as to the lawfulness and expediency of adopting the overture ; and, when the Synod met in 1797, a motion was made and agreed to by a majority of the members to dismiss the overture, and to adopt the following one in its place :—" Whereas some parts of the standard books of this Synod have been interpreted as favouring compulsory measures in religion, the Synod hereby declare, that they do not require an approbation of any such principle from any candidate for license or ordination. And whereas a controversy has arisen among us, respecting the nature and kind of the obligation of our solemn covenants on posterity, whether it be entirely of the same kind upon us as upon our ancestors who swore them, the Synod hereby declare that, while they hold the obligation of our covenants upon posterity, they do not interfere with that controversy which has arisen respecting the nature and kind of it, and recommend it to all their members to suppress that controversy as tending to gender strife rather than godly edifying, it being

understood that the Synod shall not revive this cause, till they have given sufficient information to all concerned."

The motion thus agreed to was drawn up in moderate terms, and was generally acceptable, but it was opposed by those who held strong opinions in favour of the old Covenanting principle. The ministers who took part in that opposition formed themselves, in the year 1799, into a distinct body, under the name of "The Associate Presbytery." The Synod, on the other hand, declared that the separated ministers and all who adhered to them had cut themselves off from communion with the general body, but took no further steps against them. In 1805, the Associate Presbytery assumed the title of "The Associate Synod," though the name by which they were generally known was "The Original Burgher Synod." Their position was similar to that occupied by the Constitutional Presbytery in the other branch of the Secession; and, like them, they contended for what were called the Old Light, in opposition to the New Light, opinions.¹

The separation of each of the Synods into two parties had the effect of bringing the adherents of the New Light opinions more closely into contact with each other. As time went on, the pious and intelligent members of both divisions saw how little difference there was between them on any point of real importance; and they became satisfied that, under these circumstances, it was their duty as Christians to endeavour to effect a union. Conferences took place in the year 1818, at which it was first proposed to unite all Presbyterian Dissenters in Britain holding "evangelical principles." This scheme was found to be impracticable; but the union of the Burgher and Antiburgher Synods was attended with less difficulty than even the friends of the measure anticipated.

The following was the "Basis of Union" adopted by the two Synods:—"Without interfering with the right of private judgment respecting the grounds of separation, both parties shall carefully abstain from agitating, in future, the questions which occasioned it; and, with regard to the burghess oath, both Synods agree to use what may appear to them the most

¹ M'Kerrow, p. 578-609.

proper means for obtaining the abolition of that religious clause which occasioned the religious strife, in those towns where it may still exist.

“Article I. We hold the word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only rule of faith and manners.

“Article II. We retain the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as the confession of our faith, expressive of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures ; it being always understood, however, that we do not approve or require an approbation of any thing in those books, or in any other, which teaches, or may be thought to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles of religion.

“Article III. The Presbyterian form of church government, without any superiority of office to that of a teaching presbyter, and in a due subordination of church judicatories, being the only form of government which we acknowledge as founded upon, and agreeable to, the word of God, shall be the government of the United Church ; and the Directory, as heretofore, shall be retained as a compilation of excellent rules.

“Article IV. We consider as valid those reasons of secession from the prevailing party in the judicatories of the established Church, which are stated in the Testimony that was approved of, and published by, the Associate Presbytery ; particularly the sufferance of error without adequate censure, the settling of ministers by patronage, even in reclaiming congregations, the neglect or relaxation of discipline, the restraint of ministerial freedom in testifying against maladministration, the refusal of that party to be reclaimed. And we find the grounds of secession from the judicatories of the established Church in some respects increased, instead of being diminished.

“Article V. We cherish an unfeigned veneration for our reforming ancestors, and a deep sense of the inestimable value of the benefits which accrue to us from their noble and successful efforts in the cause of civil and religious liberty. We approve of the method adopted by them for mutual excitement and encouragement, by solemn confederation and vows to God.

We acknowledge that we are under high obligations to maintain and prosecute the work of reformation begun, and to a great extent carried on, by them ; and we assert that public religious vowing or covenanting is a moral duty, to be practised when the circumstances of providence require it ; but, as the duty, from its nature, is occasional, not stated, and as there is, and may be, a diversity of sentiment respecting the seasonableness of it, we agree that, while no obstruction shall be thrown in the way, but every scriptural facility shall be afforded to those who have clearness to proceed in it, yet its observance shall not be required of any, in order to church communion.

“ Article VI. A formula shall be made up, from the formulas already existing, suited to the United Secession Church.”

The formal union was ratified at Edinburgh, on the eighth of September, 1820. “ Bristo-street church,” says Dr. M’Kerrow, “ being the spot where the separation had taken place seventy-three years before this, was appropriately selected as the scene of this noble exhibition of the power of Christian love. Here the two Synods resolved to drop for ever their distinctive badges, and to become one in profession, as they were already one in sentiment.” The last minute framed by each Synod was to the following effect :—“ The General Associate Synod (or the Associate Synod) having accepted the Basis of Union, and having by the good hand of God upon them now finished all their own business, and all preparatory arrangements, they, with fervent gratitude to God, for having led them thus far, and in humble dependence on his grace to bless the solemn and interesting step which they are now about to take, and enable them to improve the privileges, and discharge the duties which are about to devolve in consequence of it, do resolve, and hereby record their resolution, forthwith to repair to the appointed place, that they may unite with their brethren of the other Synod, to be known by the name of the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, composed of the Associate (commonly called Burgher) Synod, and of the General Associate (commonly called Anti-burgher) Synod, that they may henceforth walk with them in the fear of God, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, striv-

ing together for the faith of the Gospel, for the purity of divine ordinances, and for the enlargement of the Church of Christ."

The union thus effected was an act in which all Christians had cause to rejoice, however much they might differ in opinion from the parties concerned. Those by whom its benefits were directly felt looked on with religious joy and exultation. The historian of the event observes : " The way was prepared in a remarkable manner, by the course of events, for the effecting of this union. Obstacles were unexpectedly removed. No compromise of principle was made by either party. The abolition of the obnoxious clause in the burgess oath by the town councils removed all danger of future discussion on this point. So complete was the spirit of union that pervaded the two bodies, that of the Associate Synod there was not one minister who did not become a member of the United Synod ; and of the General Associate Synod there were only a few, a very few (as we shall afterwards see), who, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, considered it their duty to stand aloof, after the union was accomplished.¹"

It had been agreed in the sixth article of the Basis of Union that a formula was to be made up from the formulas already existing, suited to the United Secession Church. This formula referred to questions to be used in licensing preachers, and in ordaining ministers and elders. A new formula was accordingly prepared, and adopted by the synod of the United Secession Church. Dr. M'Kerrow mentions that " some of the questions in it occasioned considerable diversity of opinion, and underwent much discussion." " Eleven ministers," he adds, " and one elder, dissented from the particular phraseology employed in the third question, which required an acknowledgment of the Presbyterian form of church government as the *only* form 'founded upon and agreeable to the word of God.' Sixteen ministers and one elder dissented from the adopting of the fourth question, which requires an acknowledgment, 'that public religious vowing or covenanting is a moral duty, to be practised when the circumstances of providence require it ;' and also an approbation 'of the method adopted by our reforming ancestors, for mutual excitement

¹ M'Kerrow, p. 645-664.

and encouragement, by solemn confederation and vows to God.'"¹

It has already been mentioned that the opinions of the Independents re-appeared in Scotland during the concluding years of the eighteenth century. The system of Independency, or, as its adherents generally called it, Congregationalism, took its rise at that time in a manner different from what had hitherto been the case with any of the other religious communions in Scotland. It was not the result of dissatisfaction with the doctrine or discipline of the established Church. Its introduction was owing to the exertions of a few individuals, whose opinions, in matters of doctrine, were originally, and continued to be, strongly Calvinistic, and who at first attached little importance to any form of ecclesiastical polity, but lamented the spiritual apathy and formalism which they believed to be prevalent among all denominations. It was against the established Church that their accusations were chiefly directed. Their accounts of the ignorance and carelessness of the parish ministers, and of the irreligious condition of the people under their charge, contained very exaggerated statements. The Presbyterian discipline was far from being the perfect system described by Sir Henry Moncreiff in his *Life of Erskine*, and by other writers of that time; but it was still less accordant with truth for the early preachers of Congregationalism to speak of it as utterly powerless in the cause of religion.

The persons who first most strenuously promoted the Independent tenets were two brothers, Robert and James Haldane. Born of an ancient and respectable Scottish family, and designed for a very different course of life from that by which they became best known, both these gentlemen, in early manhood, retired from the navy, and soon afterwards devoted themselves to what they believed the providential task of awakening their countrymen to the necessity of a stricter religious profession. One of them was subsequently ordained a pastor after the Independent form; but, at first, neither of the two had any ordination or external call to the office of the ministry. They nevertheless went about preaching in the towns and villages, sometimes in churches and

¹ M'Kerrow, pp. 669, 670.

meeting-houses, or in buildings used for secular purposes, at other times in the open air, as might be most likely to attract an audience. Among their coadjutors, the most conspicuous was Greville Ewing, a minister of the established Church, who resigned his connection with that body in order to pursue his new course with more freedom and conscientiousness. Meeting-houses were soon erected or purchased in various parts of Scotland, chiefly in the large towns; and, like those used by the followers of Whitefield, they were at first generally known by the name of Tabernacles. To the upholding of these buildings, and to the support of their ministers, the fortunes of the Haldanes were freely devoted.

It can hardly be said that the Congregational system ever became popular in Scotland, though its preachers, or missionaries as they were frequently styled, found many hearers. In the towns, however, it acquired considerable influence; and many young men of talent left the various Presbyterian bodies, and adopted its principles. Among the most distinguished of these converts was Ralph Wardlaw, then a divinity student in connection with the Burgher Synod, who ascribed his change of opinion chiefly to the perusal of Dr. Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History.

The leading doctrine of the Independents, in regard to ecclesiastical polity, was, that all power was derived from the people, and that each congregation was in itself a complete Church. Such a principle necessarily led to great laxity of belief and practice in regard to the ministerial office; and opinions became prevalent among a large section of the Congregationalists, which seemed to overthrow all distinction between pastor and people. The Haldanes identified themselves with these views; and, at the same time, carrying out to the full extent the doctrine which they had always entertained regarding the sacraments, they publicly avowed their conversion to the tenets of the Baptist denomination. A schism took place in consequence. Those who adhered to the proper principles of the Independents withdrew from communion with the others, and finally made a practical admission of the impossibility of literally carrying out their system, by forming themselves into an association, under the name of the Congregational Union of Scotland. This

disruption among the Independents took place in the year 1808: the Congregational Union met for the first time in 1813.¹

¹ See the *Memoirs of the Haldanes*, from chapter vi. to chapter xvi. ; and Dr. Lindsay Alexander's *Memoirs of Dr. Wardlaw*, 2d ed. pp. 38-46, 111, 112, 171, 172.

CHAPTER LXXXVI.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING GEORGE III. IN JANUARY, 1820, TO THE SYNOD OF EDINBURGH IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, 1838.

Address of the Scottish Bishops to King George the Fourth—Puritanical opinions again appear in Edinburgh—Bishop Hobart visits Scotland—His interview with Bishop Jolly at Aberdeen—Dean Skinner's letter regarding the admission of the laity to a share in the government of the Church—Consecration of Bishop Luscombe—Calvinistic teaching of Mr. Edward Craig—Declaration by the clergy presented to the Bishops—Synod of Laurencekirk in 1828—Canons agreed to by the Synod—Objections of Bishop Jolly—Synod of Edinburgh in 1829—Death of Bishop Sandford—Dr. Walker elected Bishop of Edinburgh—Address of the Scottish Bishops to King William the Fourth—Sympathy of the Scottish Prelates with the ecclesiastical movement in England—Bishop Walker appointed Primus—Death of Bishop Jolly—His character—Synod of Edinburgh in 1838—Canons agreed to by the Synod.

KING GEORGE the Fourth visited his northern kingdom in the autumn of 1822, and received an enthusiastic welcome. All classes hastened to testify their loyalty to their sovereign, and none did so with more devoted attachment than the Scottish prelates. They were received by the king in the royal closet at Holyrood, and presented an address, in which allusions to their past history and principles were gracefully blended with the undivided allegiance now proffered to the head of the house of Brunswick.

The address, which was in the name of "the Bishops and Clergy of the Episcopal Church," thus proceeded:—"So many years have passed away since Scotland was honoured by the presence of its sovereign, that, to behold your majesty in the palace of the long line of our ancient monarchs, your majesty's

royal ancestors, is to us, as it must be to every true Scotsman, a matter of pride and exultation; and in this house, more especially, do we feel ourselves prompted by these emotions to declare that, within the wide compass of your majesty's dominions, are no where to be found hearts more loyal than those which beat in the breasts of the Scottish Episcopalians.

"The devoted attachment uniformly displayed by the members of our Church to him whom they have considered as their legitimate sovereign is so well known to your majesty, that it would be waste of time to repeat it here, and is, indeed, amply vouched by the lowly station which we, her bishops, now hold in society. Your majesty likewise knows that our religious principles and forms of worship are the same with those of the Church of England, from which, indeed, we twice derived our episcopacy, when it had been lost at home; and whilst we are sincerely grateful for the toleration of these principles, and the free exercise of the rites of our worship, we feel that it is to your majesty's gracious consideration, and that of your royal father, that our gratitude is in a peculiar manner due.

"We would not occupy too much of your majesty's time by protestations of our loyalty, but we must beg leave solemnly to declare, in your royal presence, that viewing in your majesty's sacred person the lineal descendant of the royal family of Scotland, and the legitimate possessor of the British throne, we feel to your majesty that devoted attachment which our principles assure us are due to our rightful sovereign; and that should evil days ever come upon your majesty's house, (which may God in his infinite mercy avert,) the house of Brunswick will find that the Scottish Episcopalians are ready to endure for it as much as they have suffered for the house of Stewart, and with heart and hand to convince the world, that in their breasts a firm attachment to the religion of their fathers is inseparably connected with unshaken loyalty to their king."¹

About the beginning of the reign of George the Fourth, Puritanical doctrines regarding the hierarchy and the sacra-

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 1-4. Stephen, vol. iv. p. 501-503.

ments, which had been unknown in the Episcopal Church since it ceased to be the national establishment, again made their appearance. It is stated by Rowland Hill that, when Mr. Simeon visited Scotland in the end of the eighteenth century, he was invited to preach on one occasion in an Episcopal chapel, but that, when it became known what his opinions were, the request was never repeated. The clergy of English orders were then in a state of separation from the Church. Since that time, the union of those ministers and their congregations, the influx of English residents and visitors, and the gradual change in the views of some of the indigenous clergy, had prepared the minds of many for the adoption of opinions alien to the spirit and principles of their communion.

The circumstance which immediately led to the propagation of Calvinistic doctrines was the temporary residence at Edinburgh of Gerard Noel, a popular preacher of the English Church, and a zealous advocate of what were called evangelical opinions. That clergyman officiated, during a vacancy, in one of the churches, and afterwards induced the congregation to accept the services of an English presbyter holding similar views. Many ill-informed persons were led away by the new doctrines; and, along with a number of nominal converts from Presbyterianism, they set ecclesiastical discipline at defiance, and claimed a right to join in the worship, either of the Episcopal Church, or of the various Presbyterian bodies, as might suit their inclination or convenience for the time.

Bishop Sandford does not appear to have made any active effort to repress these irregularities. But the Primus, who duly appreciated the evil, and who saw that it was extending to other dioceses, was desirous of applying a remedy. He thought at one time of summoning a general synod, at another of issuing a pastoral letter from the Episcopal College; and in June, 1822, he wrote to request Bishop Jolly's opinion on the subject. "You have not at Fraserburgh," he said, "any notion of the state of the Church in the south of Scotland, since the modern evangelists have found their way into every family more noted for the appearance of fervent piety than for soundness of judgment; and, unless we do more than we are doing to stop the progress of this fanaticism, and do it with prudence, combined with firmness and unanimity, I

will venture, without the spirit of prophecy, to predict that the Episcopal Church, if the vestiges of the Episcopal Church remain in Scotland, will in a few years no more resemble what she was in our younger days, than the present Church of Rome resembles that Church in the age of St. Cyprian." Finally, however, no formal steps of any kind were taken.¹

We do not hear of any special intercourse between the Scottish and American prelates subsequently to the proceedings which immediately followed the return of Bishop Seabury. In both communions, however, there were many persons to whom the consecration at Aberdeen in November, 1784, was an event which called forth the deepest sympathy in each other's welfare. Dr. Hobart, Bishop of New York, visited England in the end of the year 1823, and was gladly received by those who esteemed him for his ability and his virtues, and to whom Episcopacy was dear for its own sake, independently of any political privileges or advantages. He expected an equally welcome reception in Scotland, and was not disappointed. He spent Christmas at Edinburgh, and during the Epiphany was at Aberdeen. Among all in the North there was but one feeling of attachment to the noble-minded American prelate, and of deep sympathy with the unendowed but unfettered Church beyond the Atlantic. When Bishop Jolly heard of his arrival, he wrote to a friend that the expectation of seeing Bishop Hobart, in whom he hoped to find a second Seabury, was more like a pleasing dream than a reality, and that, rather than miss a meeting which was arranged at Aberdeen, he would make a six days journey thither on foot. The meeting took place, and Bishop Hobart spoke of the Scottish prelate, as "one of the most apostolic and primitive men he ever saw." In answer also to the question of an Edinburgh clergyman, whether what he had seen at Aberdeen had rewarded him for his long journey in the middle of winter, he said: "You go from the extremity of Britain to America to see the falls of Niagara, and think yourselves amply rewarded by the sight of this singular scene in nature. If I had gone from America to Aberdeen, and seen nothing but Bishop Jolly, as I saw him for two days, I should

¹ Stephen, vol. iv. pp. 499, 500. Neale's *Life of Bishop Torrey*, p. 103-105. *Memoirs of the Haldanes*, p. 227.

hold myself greatly rewarded. In our new country we have no such men, and I could not have imagined such without seeing him. The race, I fear, is expired, or expiring, even among you."

Bishop Hobart's visit produced one unexpected effect. Feeling deeply the little hold which Episcopacy had on the Scottish nation, and encouraged by the description which the American prelate gave of the advantages which resulted from lay co-operation in his own land, Mr. John Skinner, a presbyter at Forfar, and son of the late Primus, expressed a strong desire that the laity should be admitted to a share in the government of the Church. He addressed a circular to the bishops and clergy, in which he urged various ecclesiastical reforms, and, among others, the admission of the laity to a voice on certain questions. He thought that the changes which he suggested would afford a remedy for the general supineness and indifference which seemed to prevail among all classes in the Church.

On this subject Mr. Skinner remarked:—"Ever since the interesting general synod of 1811, a period now of nearly thirteen years, the Church, as a corporate body, has been in a state of total inaction, while every other denomination of Christians in Scotland has been assiduously busy in schemes of self-enlargement, and of individual concern. The Seceder, the Baptist, the Methodist, has been each devoting his time and talents, either to the future increase of his sect, or to its more perfect discipline and unity. The churchman alone has been doing nothing beyond the precincts of his diocese, if a bishop, or, if a presbyter, beyond the weekly routine of pastoral duty. I fear that many of us regard this as 'the one thing needful,' in fact the only thing that ought to be done. For my own part, with all due respect for the zeal and assiduity with which I am willing to believe that every bishop, as well as every Scottish presbyter, discharges the duties of the sanctuary, and every other part of his pastoral office, I cannot permit myself to consider this as the 'unum necessarium,' the only duty which he is required to perform, the only interest which he is bound to take in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical.

"As things are now constituted," he continued, "we have

nothing to interest our laity, or excite their powerful co-operation. At present they are left in ignorance of every thing but the right or wrong discipline of their immediate pastor's duty. I am aware that, as I here tread on very tender ground, I must be cautious how I advance. Indeed, did I not, as far as I mean to proceed, see my way by the light which our present constitution affords me, I would arrest my pen and retract the step that I have just taken. That lay interference in matters purely spiritual is alike contrary to Scripture and to primitive usage, every sound churchman must admit; and sooner would the writer of this address lay down his life, than in any one respect sacrifice or lay down the rights of the Christian priesthood. Yet, as in all matters of secular interest an unestablished Church cannot exist, far less prosper, without the co-operation and support of the laity, (whether expressed by canon, or as a thing too well understood to be matter of enactment,) the more that any Church can interest the laity, and attract them to the conscientious discharge of their duty, so much more will that Church be respectable and respected. We have a canon empowering the people to elect their own clergyman, and confirming to the managers or vestrymen of each congregation the entire management and disposal of its funds. What then should hinder a lay delegate or lay delegates to be associated with the clergy in ordinary diocesan synods; to sit with them in general conventions; and to be allowed a voice, not only in all matters of temporal concern, but in framing rules of lay discipline. In fact no power would thus be conceded to the people beyond that which they now either enjoy or in some measure assume; while being canonically brought into regular intercourse with the bishops and clergy, in general convention assembled, as well as with their own bishop and his presbyters in regular diocesan synod, the laity would have accurate and correct knowledge of the state of the Church, which, I hesitate not to say, would be much benefitted, in matters purely secular, by their co-operation, advice, and habits of business."

The change proposed was one for which the prelates and the great body of the clergy were yet unprepared; and, meeting with little encouragement, it fell to the ground.¹

¹ Dr. Berrian's Life of Bishop Hobart, prefixed to that prelate's Works, vol. VOL. IV.]

In the year 1825, a consecration took place in Scotland, as to the expediency of which different opinions prevailed both in that country and in England. After the conclusion of the great European war, many English families resorted to the Continent, and considerable numbers established their permanent residence in various kingdoms, particularly in France. These residents were withdrawn almost entirely from the control of the authorities of their own Church, and for the ordinary purposes of religious worship had to rely on the assistance of a few clergymen in the principal towns. An English priest, Dr. Matthew Luscombe, who had remained in France for several years, saw with deep regret the evil consequences of the want of episcopal superintendence, both among the clergy and the laity. The English bishops could do nothing without the sanction of the state, and the king's ministers were unwilling to interfere, from the dread of exciting the jealousy of the French government. Under these circumstances, Dr. Luscombe was induced to request the assistance of the Scottish prelates, mentioning his own readiness to accept consecration at their hands, should they deem such a measure advisable. It was ascertained that the English government would offer no opposition; and the bishops had only to consider the lawfulness and expediency of the proposal on ecclesiastical principles. The Bishops of Aberdeen, Murray, and Dunkeld, hesitated to comply, believing that the conduct of their predecessors, in consecrating Dr. Seabury, afforded no precedent for sending a bishop to France. As it was proposed that Dr. Luscombe should act only as a missionary bishop for the benefit of those members of the British and American Churches who were willing to put themselves under his superintendence, the other three bishops thought that no reasonable objection could be taken to the proceeding. Dr. Luscombe accordingly came to Scotland; and, on the twentieth of March, being Palm Sunday, he was consecrated at Stirling, by the Primus, and the Bishops of

i. p. 279-291. Perceval's Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833, p. 24. MS. copy of Mr. John Skinner's circular, in possession of the Rev. J. B. Pratt, Cruden. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 112-117. From the correspondence between Bishop Torry and his clergy regarding the circular, it appears that the sees of Dunkeld and Dunblane were then united; see Life of Bishop Torry, p. 116.

Edinburgh and Ross. Dr. Hook, Dean of Chichester, then curate of Whippingham, preached the consecration sermon.

The language of the deed of consecration explains the views of the three prelates who took part in it. It began by mentioning the representation made by Dr. Luscombe, "how much a Bishop, resident among the British subjects on the Continent of Europe, might promote the progress of true religion, by administering the sacred ordinance of Confirmation to their youth, by guarding themselves against the seductions of infidelity on the one hand, and of superstition on the other, and by doing every thing that a bishop can do to keep them in the old paths in which their fathers had walked before them ; and that a bishop sent for these good purposes from the United Church of England and Ireland would be much more likely to give offence to foreign governments, than a bishop from a Church which, like all Churches in the purest and earliest ages of the Gospel, has no other relation to the civil government of the state, than that of loyal subjects to their sovereign." It concluded with the following statement :—"He is sent by us, representing the Scottish Episcopal Church, to the Continent of Europe, not as a diocesan bishop in the modern or limited sense of the word, but for a purpose similar to that for which Titus was left by St. Paul in Crete, that he might set in order the things that are wanting, among such of the natives of Great Britain and Ireland as he shall find there, professing to be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. But, as our blessed Lord, when he sent out his Apostles, commanded them, saying, 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel ;' so we, following so divine an example, which was certainly left on record to the Church to guide her conduct in making future converts to the faith, do solemnly enjoin our right reverend brother, Bishop Luscombe, not to disturb the peace of any Christian society established as the national Church in whatever nation he may chance to sojourn ; but to confine his ministrations to British subjects, and such other Christians as may profess to be of a Protestant Episcopal Church. And we earnestly pray God to protect and sup-

port him in his arduous undertaking, and to grant such success to his ministry, that, among those who have turned many to righteousness, he may at last shine as the stars for ever and ever."

Dr. Luseombe returned to France, where his office was acknowledged and respected by most of the British residents. None of the evil consequences ensued which were apprehended by some ; but neither were the advantages of the measure such as its authors contemplated.¹

In 1826, the proceedings of the Edinburgh Calvinists again attracted the attention of the bishops. Mr. Edward Craig, the clergyman who had been appointed to one of the churches there by the influence of Mr. Noel, not content with propagating the new opinions among the members of his own congregation, accused the Scottish clergy generally of erroneous teaching. He asserted that the people were perishing for lack of knowledge ; that they had looked for the bread of life in the pulpit ministrations of their own Church, and had not found it ; and that those who felt the need of serious religion had been compelled, contrary to their predilections and early habits, to go elsewhere to seek it. He directed his attacks particularly against Mr. James Walker, a clergyman who had lately been appointed professor of theology by the bishops, and had been entrusted with the instruction of young men preparing for holy orders.

The Bishop of Edinburgh was urged to take judicial measures against a person who thus slandered his brethren because they did not hold his own erroneous or heretical opinions. Dr. Sandford hesitated to pronounce ecclesiastical censures which would probably be disregarded ; and, after consulting with some of his clergy, he declined to interfere, proposing only that the College of Bishops should issue a pastoral letter, declaring what was the true doctrine of the Church. An episcopal synod was held at Edinburgh in the month of August, which was attended by the Bishops of Edinburgh, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, and Ross, the prelate last named holding proxies from the Primus and the Bishop of Murray. There

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 5-7. Stephen, vol. iv. p. 506-508. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 118-138. Blatch's Life of Bishop Low, p. 96-126.

was laid before the synod a declaration signed by the Deans of Edinburgh, Ross, Aberdeen, Murray, and Dunkeld, the Archdeacons of Edinburgh and Ross, and twenty-nine presbyters and deacons. The declaration set forth, that the subscribers felt themselves called upon, contrary to their inclination and usual habits, to testify against a rash and unprovoked attack made upon the Church by a minister of their own communion. They indignantly denied the statements of Mr. Craig, and made special reference to the falsehood of his charges against Mr. Walker, whose only offence was his teaching the true doctrine of Baptism. The bishops received the declaration, and expressed their approbation of the motives in which it originated, of the principles which it laid down, and of the temperate manner in which it was expressed; but they stated that it would not be becoming in themselves, as governors of the Church, to sanction such a mode of procedure in future, as it might lead to consequences injurious to the constitution of the Church, and to the rights of the episcopal order. Nothing farther was done in the matter. Mr. Craig and his writings were soon forgotten, but the controversy regarding them led to the publication of Bishop Jolly's Friendly Address on Baptismal Regeneration.¹

For several years the Primus had suggested to his brethren the propriety of summoning another general synod in order to revise the code of canons enacted at Aberdeen in 1811. Objections had hitherto been made by some of the prelates; but, in 1828, a majority of them expressed their consent, though the Bishops of Murray and Ross were still opposed to the measure. The synod accordingly met at Laurencekirk on the eighteenth of June, and sat for three days. The members of the upper house who attended were the Primus, and the Bishops of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Dunkeld. The lower house was composed of the Deans of Edinburgh, Aberdeen,

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 10-13. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 140-147. The declaration was signed by almost all the clergy of Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Murray, and Ross. There were no signatures from the diocese of Brechin; nor from the diocese of Edinburgh, south of the Forth, except those of the dean and archdeacon. The clergy of Edinburgh seem to have thought that it was not advisable to take any notice of Craig; those of Brechin were probably of opinion that it was irregular to do so.

Dunkeld, and Murray; and of the representatives for the clergy of all the six dioceses. The Primus presided in the upper chamber; Mr. John Skinner, representative for Dunkeld, was prolocutor of the lower chamber. The canons approved by the synod were thirty in number, and bore the following title—"The Code of Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, as revised, amended, and enacted, by an Ecclesiastical Synod, holden for that purpose at Laurencekirk, in the county of Kincardine, on the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth days of June, in the year of our Lord 1828."

The introduction was the same as that prefixed to the code of 1811, with a reference, in the end of it, to the necessity for a revisal, caused by the change of circumstances during the seventeen years which had elapsed since the meeting of the former synod.

The first four canons were substantially the same as those of 1811, with the exception that the Primus was to hold his office for life, unless he voluntarily resigned it, instead of during pleasure as before; and that he was to be deprived of the office, and declared to be incapable of ever filling it again, if he refused to sanction the consecration of a priest canonically elected to a vacant district, whose election was confirmed by a majority of the bishops.

The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth canons were similar to the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth canons of 1811; the ninth making special reference to the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, as well as to the United Church of England and Ireland.

The tenth canon regulated the admission of strangers to officiate; the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth, were similar to the same canons in the former code; and the fourteenth was the same with the twenty-fifth canon in that code. The fifteenth canon ordered the names of strange preachers to be noted in a book.

The sixteenth canon, "appointing Ecclesiastical Synods and regulating the business of the same," occupied the place of the fifth canon of 1811; but its terms were in several respects different. The first part of it was to this effect:—"It is hereby ordained and enacted, that synods, both

general and diocesan, be henceforth part of the statuted and canonical discipline of this Church, and that in terms and manner following :—A diocesan synod shall be holden annually in every district of the Church, at such time and place as the ordinary, or (as empowered by him) the dean, shall appoint; one or other of whom (if both be not incapacitated from attending) shall, after a sermon by one of the clergy in rotation, deliver a charge on such topics as may be judged best suited for edification. After which, the synod being duly constituted by the ordinary, or, in his absence, by the dean, he who presides shall call upon every incumbent to lodge with the diocesan clerk his yearly report of the congregation under his charge, the number of baptisms, marriages, and deaths; of communicants at the several festivals and other communions; all which shall be severally entered by the clerk in the minute book of each diocese. Every general synod shall consist of two chambers, the first composed of the bishops alone; the second of the deans, the Pantonian professor of theology *ex officio*, and the representatives or delegates of the clergy; one such delegate being chosen from each district in which there are more than four presbyters. And one such synod shall be holden every fifth year, at such time and place as the Primus, with consent of the majority of his colleagues, shall appoint; of which synod, when constituted by prayer, it shall form the business, in the first place, to receive the reports made from the books of the diocesan synods, and transmitted by the clerks of the several dioceses through their respective deans; which reports shall exhibit, at one view, the state of every congregation within the Church: secondly, after receiving these diocesan reports, to appoint a committee of one member from each chamber, to frame a general report of the situation of the Church, which general report shall be engrossed in the sederunt book of the synod; and, if it be deemed advisable by them, the chamber of bishops shall order the same to be printed and circulated through the Church. And, thirdly, it shall be the duty of the bishops, synodically assembled, to hear appeals from either clergy or laity against the sentence of their own immediate ecclesiastical superior, when by such sentence they consider themselves to have been injured or aggrieved. But, in all such appeals, the sentence of a majority

of the bishops present in synod shall be held final and conclusive by all parties ; such regulation being conformable not only to the canons of the Universal Church, but also to the principle laid down by our Blessed Saviour Himself, 'If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.' And, for further regulating the proceedings of general synods, it is hereby enacted, that no measure shall be decided on in such synods, but by the consent and approbation of a majority of the members constituting each chamber, the preses or prolocutor of the second chamber having at all times free admission to the first, or chamber of bishops, when communication is on either side required. Nor shall any law or canon be enacted or abrogated until the same shall have been submitted to the several diocesan synods, and approved of by a majority of the clergy, as well as by a majority of those who constitute the general synod in which said enactment or abrogation was proposed, and which synod shall be considered merely as adjourned or prorogued, until the sense of the Church at large respecting the measure be ascertained."

The most important of the changes made by this canon had been suggested in the circular sent by Mr. John Skinner to the bishops and clergy in 1824. They were adopted from the rules of the American Church, and were, no doubt, strongly supported at this time by the author of the circular, now prolocutor of the lower house.

The seventeenth canon enjoined a reverent observance of the Lord's Day. The eighteenth was similar to the fourteenth canon of 1811. The nineteenth canon, which corresponded with the first part of the sixteenth of the former code, enjoined a strict adherence in the celebration of Morning and Evening Service to the words of the English Liturgy ; and this was now made obligatory on bishops as well as on presbyters and deacons, and no dispensing power was allowed to the bishops. The twentieth canon was similar to the latter part of the sixteenth of 1811 ; and the twenty-first resembled the seventeenth of that code.

The twenty-second canon shews that a better state of feeling had begun to prevail in regard to the celebration of Baptism. The preamble bears that "as the sacrament of Baptism is to

be considered a public act, it ought, unless unavoidable circumstances prevent it, to be administered in a place of public worship." In other respects there was little difference between this canon and the nineteenth of the former code. The twenty-third, twenty-fourth, and twenty-fifth canons resembled the twentieth, twenty-first, and eighteenth of that code.

The twenty-sixth canon, which related to the Communion Service, repeated the important provision of the fifteenth canon of 1811; but some changes were introduced. The approbation of the bishop of the diocese alone was declared sufficient to authorize a change from one office to the other; and the clause forbidding the Scottish Office to be laid aside, unless by authority of the College of Bishops, was omitted.

The twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth canons were similar to the twenty-second and twenty-third of the former code. The twenty-ninth canon prescribed rules in regard to the establishment of new congregations.

The thirtieth and last canon, which came in place of the twenty-sixth canon of 1811, omitted the rule in regard to admonition and suspension, and the harsh threat of deposition in the event of an unsuccessful appeal to the Episcopal College, and concluded with the following declaration:—"As in all societies, ecclesiastical as well as civil, there will always be some individuals whose conduct is not so much guided as it ought to be by the love of Christ; and as it is chiefly for the direction of such persons that canons and laws are enacted; it is hereby decreed, that if any clergyman, whether bishop, presbyter, or deacon, shall wantonly and habitually disobey any of the above canons, he shall, after the first and second admonition by his ecclesiastical superior, be rejected, and publicly declared to be no longer a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland. But, afterwards, on giving sufficient evidence of a sincere repentance, he may be restored to his former station by the sentence of a majority of the bishops."

To the code of 1828, as to that of 1811, an appendix of ecclesiastical writs was annexed.¹

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 14-41. See also the Canons, as printed at Edinburgh in 1828; and Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, pp. 113, 114.

As already mentioned, Bishop Jolly and Bishop Low did not approve of the calling of the synod, and neither was present at its deliberations. The former had some objections to the use of the word "Protestant," as prefixed, for the first time, to the name of the Church, in the title of the code, and in the canons. In a letter, which he wrote to Bishop Low soon after the synod, he said: "I would have humbly objected to the prefix of Protestant, which implies, and seems to admit, that there is another Episcopal Church in Scotland, under a different denomination; but we acknowledge no other, whether from Rome or Geneva, and therefore, it appears to me that it would have been more dignified—more suitable, I mean, to the honour which we claim in our Lord's name—to have kept our Church's title as it stood before simply, without seeming to divide or compound with any. This, however, is but a trifle, easily to be yielded. But I see other things, which I think of more serious consideration, and must wonder that they so readily found their way: but indeed they are matters only under consideration still."

The other matters referred to by Bishop Jolly were the new provisions in the sixteenth canon, which seemed to imply that the formal sanction of any measure brought before a general synod depended on the approbation of a majority of the clergy. There was some misapprehension on the part of the Primus himself in regard to this enactment; and, in order to settle the question, another synod was summoned to meet at Edinburgh on the seventeenth of June, 1829. It was attended by all the bishops and deans, by representatives from the six dioceses, and by Dr. Walker, Professor of Theology, being the whole persons entitled to sit in a general synod. The Primus presided, and Mr. John Skinner, now Dean of Dunkeld, was again chosen prolocutor of the lower house. A few unimportant amendments were made in other parts of the sixteenth canon of the previous year; and the clause chiefly objected to was thus corrected:—"Nor shall any law or canon, affecting the constitution of the Church, be enacted or abrogated, unless the same shall have been previously submitted to the several diocesan synods or consistories, and the sense of the clergy of the Church at large respecting the measure be ascertained. But the sense of the clergy at large being the sense of the

majority, and the presbyters being more in number than the bishops, the sense of the clergy at large cannot have the authority of a canon unless adopted as such by the majority of the bishops synodically assembled."¹

Bishop Sandford, whose health had long been infirm, died at Edinburgh on the fourteenth day of January, 1830. He was a good man and an accomplished scholar, and was firmly attached to the doctrines and polity of the Church. His personal character was more winning and attractive than that of some of the native prelates; but his own writings shew that the cause of the Scottish Church was not to him, what it was to them, almost the only object of anxiety and care.

The clergy of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Fife, having received a mandate for the election of a bishop, met on the tenth of February, and made choice of Dr. James Walker, formerly one of their own number, now Professor of Theology. The new prelate possessed very high qualifications for his sacred office. He was a supporter of those doctrines to which the Episcopal Church had particularly been called to bear witness, and which were associated with the life and teaching of his intimate friend Bishop Jolly. His knowledge was not of that limited kind which was unavoidably the general characteristic of the Scottish clergy of his day. It was improved by an acquaintance with other countries and with the members of other communions; and his zeal for the truth was tempered by charity for those who differed from him. His election was immediately confirmed by the Episcopal College; and, on Sunday the seventh of March, he was consecrated at Stirling by the Primus, and the Bishops of Murray, Aberdeen, and Ross.²

In the contest respecting ecclesiastical establishments, which arose in Scotland during the reign of William the Fourth, the clergy of the Episcopal Church took no part. In the similar controversy which prevailed in England, their warmest sympathies were enlisted on the side of the national Church. The opinions which they held will be best understood from the

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 43, 44, 64. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 149-154. Blatch's Life of Bishop Low, p. 147-149.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 45. Remains of Bishop Sandford, vol. i. p. 66-75. Blatch's Life of Bishop Low, p. 150-153.

following address, subscribed by the six bishops, and presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the king in the year 1835 :—

“ Whilst we tender our most grateful thanks for the toleration we enjoy in common with all your majesty’s subjects, we beg leave, adopting, as we do, the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the United Church of England and Ireland, humbly to offer our heartfelt sympathy for the present distressing state of that portion of the Church which is established in Ireland, and to express our alarm and conviction that the threatened attack of the Church, if extended to England, will be attended with all the calamitous consequences of the grand rebellion.

“ Although we cannot conscientiously unite in communion with the ecclesiastical establishment in Scotland, we live on terms of perfect harmony with its ministers and members ; and we regard, with sincere and friendly concern, the machinations which have been formed against that establishment, as well by pretended friends as by professed enemies ; the principles of that branch of the Church of Christ, to which we happily belong, having always been, and we trust always will be, to ‘ fear God and honour the king, and to meddle not with them that are given to change.’

“ We beg leave humbly to offer our hearty thanks for your majesty’s most gracious expression of regard and affection towards the United Church of England and Ireland as by law established, and for your royal solicitude for its protection and welfare.”¹

The dangers which surrounded the English Church after the passing of the Reform Act, directed the attention of her most zealous members to the necessity of relying more on her primitive doctrines and apostolic government, than on the doubtful support of the temporal power. They naturally looked for example and encouragement to what had been done in Scotland under greater trials. A correspondence took place between some of the leaders of the movement in the South and the Scottish prelates ; and the latter readily gave their assistance to efforts, which were then unaccompanied by any circumstances of doubt or suspicion. “ Thus,” one of the Eng-

¹ Stephen, vol. iv. pp. 530, 531. Stephen’s Episcopal Magazine, vol. iii. p. 160. Blatch’s Life of Bishop Low, p. 170-172.

lish clergy remarks, "in the hour of our greatest danger we found comfort and support. . . . The clear calm note of Christian confidence and hope, which sounded from the bishops of the Scottish Church, was like a voice from heaven, and we thanked God, and took courage." The bishops were the more attracted towards their English friends, on discovering that their principles, on various questions of doctrine and ritual, resembled those which had for many years been held in Scotland, rather than the opinions which had obtained the ascendancy in the English Church after the Revolution.¹

Bishop Gleig had attained an advanced age, and for some years his bodily infirmities had almost incapacitated him for the proper discharge of his duties. Yielding to the entreaties of his colleagues, he resigned the primacy in February, 1837. On the twenty-fourth of May following, an episcopal synod was held at Aberdeen, which was attended by the Bishops of Dunkeld, Aberdeen, and Ross, the remaining bishops being represented by some of those present as their proxies; and Dr. Walker, Bishop of Edinburgh, was chosen Primus by a majority of votes. The assembled prelates agreed to suggest to their brethren the expediency of summoning a general synod for the purpose of amending the canons; and, in order to make the necessary arrangements, they recommended the holding of another episcopal synod in the course of the autumn.²

The episcopal synod met at Edinburgh in the month of August, and it was then agreed that the general synod should be summoned in the course of the following year. The prelates had under their consideration the state of the dioceses of Murray and Brechin. Bishop Jolly, as well as Bishop Gleig, was in very infirm health; but neither was willing to resign his see. It was resolved to issue a mandate to the clergy of Brechin for the election of a coadjutor-bishop, although the canons made no provision for such a contingency; and, as the congregations in Murray were few in number, to unite that diocese to Ross, according to the practice of former times, on the death of its present bishop. It was also determined to

¹ See Perceval's Collection of Papers, pp. 22-24, 44-49.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 46-48. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 171-175.

separate again the diocese of Glasgow from that of Edinburgh; and a mandate was accordingly issued to the clergy of Glasgow for the election of a bishop.

The clergy of Brechin met at Montrose, on the twenty-fourth of August, and made choice of David Moir, a presbyter at Brechin, as bishop-coadjutor. On the thirtieth of the same month, the clergy of Glasgow met at the ancient cathedral city of the diocese, and elected as bishop Dr. Michael Russell, Dean of Edinburgh. Both elections were confirmed by the Episcopal College; and the new prelates were consecrated at Edinburgh, on Sunday the eighth of October, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Aberdeen and Ross. No consecration had taken place in that city since Bishop Alexander's in 1743. The separation of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and the increase in the numbers of the clergy and laity in the southern dioceses, now aided in transferring to the capital that ascendancy in the counsels of the Church, which had so long been possessed by the northern dioceses, particularly by Aberdeen. Various circumstances contributed to strengthen the influence of Edinburgh, and every year the effects of the change became more perceptible.

At an episcopal synod held the day after the consecration of the two bishops, it was resolved to separate the district of Fife from the diocese of Edinburgh, and to annex it to the united diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane.¹

On the morning of St. Peter's day, 1838, Bishop Jolly died at Fraserburgh. No human eye beheld his departure. He was found with his hands crossed upon his breast; and the serenity of his countenance shewed that his end had been peaceful. His character may best be given in the language of one who knew him well. "It was formed upon the model of the primitive saints, not as being, it may well be believed, the result of studious imitation, but the fruit of the same principles, cherished with a like earnestness and simplicity of purpose, and developed through the same means. It was the character so formed and exhibited that attracted to Bishop Jolly a degree of reverence and affection which it is the lot of few men to enjoy. Few, indeed, have deserved to be so re-

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 49, 50, 55-58. Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, p. 178-182.

verenced and beloved. The spirit of primitive and apostolic piety seemed to be revived in him. All who had the happiness and the privilege of familiar intercourse with him, saw that he realised a character which they knew not to be common in our age, while they could not but recognise its harmony with the most perfect development of Christian temper. He was a living example of the intrinsic beauty and attractiveness of religion, as it may be developed through the church system. It might, perhaps, be easy to find a divine as deeply learned; but seldom can the name of one be recorded, who so thoroughly imbibed and exemplified the spirit of the blessed saints whose works and history were the subject of his study. The last book which the venerable bishop had in his hand, the evening before his death, was the treatise of Christopher Sutton, 'Disce mori, Learn to die.' It was an art which the good man had been learning all his life long, and he had so learned it, that the 'last enemy' had no terrors for him. He remarked to a friend, a few days previous to his decease, that he was waiting his call, not impatiently, yet longing for it: it did not, therefore, come suddenly. Death was to him but the removal of the veil which divided him from a world in which he had for years 'habitually dwelt in heart and mind.' His remains were interred in the church-yard of Turriff—the place of his first pastoral charge.¹

The clergy of Murray requested the Episcopal College to issue a mandate for the election of a successor to their late bishop; but the College adhered to its former resolution, and Murray was united to the diocese of Ross and Argyll, under the jurisdiction of Bishop Low.²

The general synod met at Edinburgh, on the twenty-ninth of August, 1838, and continued its sittings till the sixth of September. It was attended by all the prelates, except the aged Bishop of Brechin; by the Deans of Edinburgh, Glas-

¹ See Mr. Pressley's Sermon on the death of Bishop Jolly, p. 19-21; Dr. Walker's Memoir, p. 17; and Mr. Cheyne's Memoir, p. xiii.-xv. Besides the Address on Baptismal Regeneration, formerly referred to, Bishop Jolly wrote Observations on the Sunday Services in the Book of Common Prayer; a work on the Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist; and a short treatise entitled "Some plain Instructions concerning the nature and constitution of the Christian Church."

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 98-100.

gow, Aberdeen, Dunkeld, and Brechin; and by the representatives of the clergy of all the dioceses. The Primus presided in the upper house; Mr. Heneage Horsley, Dean of Brechin, was prolocutor of the lower house. The canons of 1828 were revised and altered in various respects; and the new code, containing in all forty-one canons, was published under the following title:—"The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, as revised, amended, and enacted by an Ecclesiastical Synod, holden for that purpose at Edinburgh, on the twenty-ninth day of August, and continued by adjournment till the sixth of September inclusive, in the year of our Lord 1838." In the title, and in the canons themselves, the word "Protestant," prefixed to the name of the Church, which had been adopted for the first time in 1828, was omitted.

The introduction and the first canon were similar to those in the former code.

Some alterations were made in the second canon regulating the election and office of the Primus, the most important being that the Primus was to hold his office only during the pleasure of the Episcopal College. The third canon did not differ in any essential point from the third canon of 1828.

The fourth canon was a new one, and was intended to regulate the appointment of coadjutor-bishops. It was to the following effect:—"It shall be lawful for a bishop, whose age or infirmities require it, of which the majority of the College of Bishops shall be the judges, to have a coadjutor or assistant, provided the said bishop consent that the election of such coadjutor by the clergy of the diocese shall be free, uninfluenced, and unbiassed, and provided the person so elected shall succeed on the death or resignation of the diocesan. Such assistant-bishop, during the life of his principal, shall be entitled to attend episcopal and general synods of the Church, to give his opinion and advice on any matter under consideration, but to have no vote except in the absence of the diocesan bishop."

The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth canons were similar to the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, eleventh, twelfth,

thirteenth, fourteenth, tenth, fifteenth, twenty-second, twenty-third, twenty-fourth, and twenty-fifth canons of 1828.

The twenty-first canon, respecting the Communion Service, enjoined the use of the Scottish Office, not only at the consecration of bishops, but also at the opening of general synods.

The twenty-second, twenty-third, and twenty-fourth canons embraced the provisions contained in the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth canons of the former code. The twenty-fifth canon forbade money to be exacted for the performance of religious offices. The twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh canons resembled the seventeenth and eighteenth of 1828.

The twenty-eighth canon enlarged and made more strict the provisions of the nineteenth canon of 1828, and enjoined the use of the surplice which had formerly been only recommended. It was to the following effect:—"As in all the ordinary parts of Divine Service, it is necessary to fix, by authority, the precise form, from which no bishop, presbyter, or deacon, shall be at liberty to depart, by his own alterations or insertions, lest such liberty should produce consequences destructive of 'decency and order,' it is hereby enacted that, in the performance of Morning and Evening Service, the words and rubrical directions of the English Liturgy shall be strictly adhered to: and it is further decreed that, if any clergyman shall officiate or preach in any place publicly without using the Liturgy at all, he shall, for the first offence, be admonished by his bishop, and, if he persevere in this uncanonical practice, shall be suspended, until, after due contrition, he be restored to the exercise of his clerical functions. In publicly reading prayers and administering the sacraments, the surplice shall be used as the proper sacerdotal vestment."

The twenty-ninth and thirtieth canons were similar to the twenty-first and twentieth of the former code.

The provisions of the thirty-first canon, respecting Diocesan Synods, resembled those of the sixteenth canon of 1828, so far as applicable to that subject. The thirty-second canon contained regulations as to general synods, and made several changes from the former rule. Its most important enactments were the following:—"Every general synod shall consist of two chambers, the first composed of the bishops alone; the second of the deans, the Pantonian professor of theology ex

officio, and the representatives or delegates of the clergy, one such delegate being chosen by and from the incumbents of each diocese. The second chamber shall elect a Preses or Prolocutor, who shall at all times have free admission to the first chamber, when communication is on either side required. Canons or rules for the order and discipline of the Church shall be made and enacted by a general synod only; and no law or canon shall be enacted, abrogated, or altered, but by the consent and with the approbation of the majority of both chambers. If the chambers shall happen to be equally divided in their opinions on any question, the Primus in the upper house, and the Prolocutor in the lower, shall have the casting vote. And whereas the assembling of a general synod can only be necessary when important business occurs in the Church, it is hereby decreed, that the times for holding such synods shall be left to the determination of a numerical majority of the bishops. When any bishop is disabled from being personally present at a general synod, through infirmity or pressing inconvenience, (to be duly notified to the Primus, and by him to the other bishops,) he may propose to the synod, in writing, any measure which he shall judge expedient, or express his opinion concerning any question or matter to be brought before the synod; which opinion shall be entitled to due consideration and respect, but shall not be held as his canonical vote."

The thirty-third canon contained further provisions on the same point. It declared that "a general synod of the Church, duly and regularly summoned, has the undoubted power to alter, amend, and abrogate the canons in force, and to make new canons; and the said alterations, amendments, abrogations, and new canons, being in conformity with the recognised constitution and acknowledged practice of this Church, shall not only oblige the minority in the said synod, but all the absent members of the Church."

The thirty-fourth canon appointed an episcopal synod to be held once every year. This canon, and the two following, which prescribed the conditions of appeal to the episcopal synod from the sentence of the ordinary, and laid down rules in regard to accusations against bishops, presbyters, or deacons, shewed the increasing number and importance of the

subjects which were now brought before the bishops for decision.

The thirty-seventh canon, which prohibited the clergy of one diocese from interfering with the concerns of another, was the same as the concluding part of the thirteenth canon of 1828.

The thirty-eighth canon gave authority to the episcopal synod, when necessary, to issue a pastoral letter, containing an account of the state of the Church. The thirty-ninth, "appointing the mode of admitting new congregations into the Church," was in substance the same as the twenty-ninth canon of the former code; but its provisions were now limited to those towns and villages in which another congregation was already established.

The fortieth canon was occasioned by the urgent need there was of making adequate provision for the support and education of the clergy. It enjoined the formation of a society to be called "The Scottish Episcopal Church Society," the objects of which were to be, "first, to provide a fund for aged or infirm clergymen, or salaries for their assistants, and general aid for congregations struggling with pecuniary difficulties; secondly, to assist candidates for the ministry in completing their theological studies; thirdly, to provide episcopal schoolmasters, books and tracts, for the poor; fourthly, to assist in the formation or enlargement of diocesan libraries."

The forty-first canon was the same as the thirtieth canon of 1828.

The code contained also an appendix of ecclesiastical writs.¹

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 67-97. Stephen's Episcopal Magazine, vol. vi. pp. 323, 324. See also the Canons, as printed at Edinburgh in 1838.

CHAPTER LXXXVII.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING GEORGE IV. IN JUNE, 1830, TO THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY IN MAY, 1840.

Account of Edward Irving—His doctrines censured by the General Assembly—He is deposed—Deposition of Mr. Campbell—Controversy regarding Ecclesiastical Establishments—Account of Dr. Thomas Chalmers—Renewed struggle between the two parties in the Church—Discussions in the General Assembly of 1833—General Assembly of 1834—The Veto Act—Act regarding Chapels of Ease—Disputed settlement in the parish of Auchterarder—Decision of the Court of Session—Resolution of the General Assembly regarding the jurisdiction of the Church—Decision of the House of Lords in the Auchterarder case—Measures of the popular party—Commemoration of the Glasgow Assembly of 1638—General Assembly of 1839—Discussion regarding the Veto Act—The Original Burgher Synod joins the Established Church—The Lethendy case—The Marnoch case—The majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie are suspended by the General Assembly—Conflict between the civil and the ecclesiastical courts—Application to the Government and the Legislature—General Assembly of 1840

THE conclusion of the reign of George the Fourth, and the commencement of that of his successor, witnessed the revival of opinions, resembling those of some of the ancient sects, in regard to the human nature of our Lord. The advocates of these opinions entertained also peculiar notions about the millennium, and laid claim to the recovery of the miraculous gift of tongues. Edward Irving, the leader of the movement, was born at Annan, in Dumfries-shire. He was licensed as a preacher by the Presbytery of Kirkaldy, and afterwards acted for some time as assistant to Dr. Chalmers at Glasgow. In

the year 1822, he was invited to become minister of a congregation in London in communion with the established Church of Scotland, and was ordained to that charge by the Presbytery of Annan. In the capital he became famous as a preacher ; but the popular applause after some years began to wane, and, on the promulgation of his new opinions, entirely deserted him.

Irving's belief, though erroneous, was enthusiastic and sincere. The loss of popularity, and the opposition with which he was threatened, had no effect in abating his zeal. In 1830, he published a work, entitled "The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Humanity." The Presbytery of London appointed a committee to examine the book, who reported that the author's tenets, on certain points, were contrary to the Scriptures, and the standards of the Presbyterian Church. Irving was summoned before the presbytery but refused to appear. He was in consequence declared to be no longer a member of the presbytery, nor capable of being admitted to it, until he had publicly renounced his errors. He paid no attention to this sentence, but continued to officiate as before.

When the general assembly met in 1831, Irving's opinions, and the books in which they were put forth, became the subject of discussion. A committee was appointed to examine the books. They reported that they had found various objectionable passages in the "Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine," and in another work published in 1831. In particular, they referred to what they believed to be an "assertion of the sinful corruption of Christ's human nature, and a rebellion in Christ's natural will to the will of God ;" an opinion which, they said, was one of the heresies of Madame Bourignon, expressly condemned by the general assembly in the case of Dr. George Garden. Some members of the assembly objected to the competency of any proceedings in connection with a work alleged to be written by a person residing out of Scotland, and over whom they had no jurisdiction. The assembly, however, by a great majority, approved of the report of the committee, and enjoined any presbytery, within whose bounds Irving might come claiming the rights and privileges of a licentiate or an ordained minister, to call him before them, and

to require an answer whether he acknowledged himself to be the author of the books, and thereafter to proceed in the matter as they might see cause.

Another discussion on the subject took place before the commission of the general assembly in March, 1832. As before, there were different opinions on the competency of the proceedings; but a majority of the members agreed to appoint a committee to enquire into the character of the reputed doctrines and proceedings of Mr. Irving since last assembly, and as to the measures which it might be competent and right for the Church to adopt, and to report to the next assembly.

The committee made their report accordingly to the general assembly of 1832, referring both to the erroneous opinions promulgated by Mr. Irving, and to the encouragement given by him to persons claiming supernatural gifts. They expressed an opinion that it was competent for the Church to call to account all persons on whom it had conferred license or ordination, and that this jurisdiction had nothing to do with the local situation of the parties. The committee further recommended that the Presbytery of Annan, from which Mr. Irving had received ordination, should be instructed to proceed against him. The report of the committee was approved of by the assembly, and the Presbytery of Annan was ordered to proceed accordingly, and to report to the next assembly.

In terms of these instructions, Mr. Irving was cited to appear before the Presbytery of Annan. On the day appointed for his trial, the thirteenth of March, 1833, he appeared to answer to the citation. He at once admitted that he was the author of the various publications founded on; but he denied the erroneous doctrines alleged to be contained in them, and denounced, in violent and somewhat incoherent language, the proceedings which had been taken against him. The members of the court unanimously expressed an opinion that the charges were proved, and that Mr. Irving ought to be deposed from his office of the ministry. The end of the trial may be related in the words of the contemporary report:—"The moderator was now about to proceed to the solemn duty which had devolved upon him, and, as a preliminary, requested Mr. Sloan, the senior member of the presbytery, to offer up a prayer to Almighty God, when a voice was heard from the

pew in which Mr. Irving was seated, and which immediately was found to be that of Mr. Dow, late minister of Irongray, exclaiming, 'Arise, depart—arise, depart—flee ye out, flee ye out of her—ye cannot pray.—How can ye pray to Christ whom ye deny? Ye cannot pray.—Depart—depart—flee—flee.' As he uttered these words, his countenance assumed the appearance of one under the influence of a temporary aberration of mind; and though interrupted by repeated cries of order, he continued, with little abatement, till exhaustion forced him to conclude. The assembly, which was very numerous, and had acted in the most becoming manner, now became confused, and Mr. Dow rose to leave the house, leading Mr. Irving after him. Mr. Irving lifted up his hand as he was going, and said, 'Will ye not obey the voice of the Holy Ghost, which ye have now heard? As many as will obey the Holy Ghost, follow.' The two gentlemen, along with several others who belonged to their party, having left the church, Mr. Sloan prayed, and the moderator then solemnly pronounced the sentence of deposition."

The proceedings of the Presbytery of Annan were reported to the general Assembly of 1833, and were formally approved of.

Mr. Irving returned to London where he had many attached followers, but his strength sunk under the effects of labour and anxiety. He once more came back to his native country, and died at Glasgow on the eighth of December, 1834, in the forty-third year of his age.¹

Several ministers and preachers in Scotland had embraced Irving's opinions. One of these, John Macleod Campbell, minister at Row in Dunbartonshire, maintained also various other alleged errors. He was tried before the Presbytery of Dunbarton, on a charge of teaching "the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ," and "the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation." The presbytery found these charges to be proved; and, an appeal having been taken by Mr.

¹ Edinburgh Christian Instructor, vol. xxx. pp. 17, 18, 442, 460, 461. Edinburgh Christian Instructor, new series, vol. i. pp. 210-213, 433, 434; vol. ii. pp. 203-215, 506; vol. iv. p. 143. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, first ed. vol. iii. pp. 287, 288, 290.

Campbell to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, the case was referred by that court to the general assembly. The reference came before the assembly of 1831. The charges were found to be proved, and the court deposed Mr. Campbell "from the office of the holy ministry, forbidding and discharging him from exercising the same, or any part thereof, in all time coming, under pain of the highest censure of the Church."¹

It is singular that the two opinions, for which Mr. Campbell was deposed, with the entire concurrence of the popular party, were among the alleged errors for which the general assembly had, in the previous century, censured the Marrow of Modern Divinity. Dr. Chalmers was a member of the assembly of 1831, but took no part in the proceedings connected with the sentences pronounced on Irving and Campbell. His personal regard for the former may have influenced him to some extent; but it was not his only motive. His biographer tells us that "from the daring speculations of Mr. Irving he sensitively shrunk back, but his strong convictions as to the unconditional freeness of the Gospel offer, and his substantial agreement with many of the leading doctrines of those generally denominated Marrow-men, disposed him to judge mildly of the errors" of Mr. Campbell. "He never questioned," it is added, "either the necessity or the justice of any of the sentences passed by the assembly; but he did not hesitate to say, that could a window have been opened into Mr. Campbell's breast, it would have been seen that he did not differ so greatly from many of his brethren in the ministry, as looking simply to the evidence of statements and facts they were judicially compelled to believe." If these were Dr. Chalmers's opinions, he should not have shrunk from avowing them before the assembly, when the sentence of deposition was pronounced on Mr. Campbell.²

About this time a controversy arose in regard to the lawfulness and expediency of national ecclesiastical establishments. A great majority of the powerful body forming the United

¹ Edinburgh Christian Instructor, vol. xxx. pp. 298-300, 445-447.

² See Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iii. pp. 246-248, 290, 291. See also in the Edinburgh Christian Instructor, vol. xxx. p. 550, the condemned passages of the Marrow, as given by Dr. M'Crie in his account of that controversy.

Secession Church, and almost all the members of the Congregationalist communion, were strongly opposed to any connection whatever between Church and State. The important political events, which marked the beginning of the reign of William the Fourth, gave encouragement to the opponents of the established Church; and an open and systematic attack was made on its privileges. The controversy was carried on chiefly through the press. Able works were written on both sides, the most distinguished among the defenders of ecclesiastical establishments being Dr. Inglis and Dr. Chalmers, while, among their opponents, Mr. Marshall, a minister of the Secession Church, and Dr. Wardlaw, took a chief share. Much bitterness of feeling was shewn; and, as usual in such disputes, both parties carried their opinions too far. The one seemed almost disposed to maintain that there could be no security for true religion, no adequate means of making Christianity known to a nation, without assistance from the secular power; the other to deny the right of the state to encourage religion by endowments or in any way whatever.

The defenders of ecclesiastical establishments were finally successful in preserving their rights unimpaired; but, while the strife was yet doubtful, they endeavoured to shew that they were conscious of the duties which their privileges imposed upon them, by making a vigorous effort to promote the religious well-being of the people. Contributions were liberally made, and within a few years many new churches were built. The success of this voluntary attempt was sufficient to shew, that the munificence of individual Christians might at times be a surer and better support than the assistance of the state.

In the great effort thus made to provide means for religious worship and education, the foremost and most powerful champion of the established Church was Dr. Chalmers; and his success increased the wide reputation which he already enjoyed. Thomas Chalmers was born at Anstruther, in Fifeshire, on the seventeenth of March, 1780, and was educated at the University of St. Andrews. When twenty-three years of age, he was appointed minister at Kilmany in his native county. His religious opinions for some time resembled those which were commonly held at that period by the members of the

moderate party, but they were gradually renounced for those of the new evangelical school. He left Kilmany in 1815, on being appointed one of the parish ministers of Glasgow. In that city his great powers as a preacher made him very popular; but he obtained a nobler claim to the reverence and esteem of his countrymen, by the efforts which he made to restore the efficiency of the parochial system, and to bring the daily life and conversation of those entrusted to his charge under the influence of religion. In 1823, he was appointed professor of moral philosophy at St. Andrews, and, in 1827, was translated to the divinity chair in the University of Edinburgh.

Dr. Chalmers was frequently a member of the general assembly, and distinguished himself there and in the inferior ecclesiastical courts by his opposition to pluralities. Many years before, he had held a different opinion on that point, and on the attention necessary to a proper discharge of the pastoral office. In the course of the Leslie controversy, he had published a pamphlet, in answer to a statement of Mr. Playfair, that no one could be found among the ministers of the established Church competent to perform the duties of the mathematical chair. The pamphlet was anonymous, but was known to be from the pen of Chalmers. In a debate on pluralities in the assembly of 1825, one of the speakers on the moderate side quoted the following passage from the work referred to:—"The author of this pamphlet can assert, from what to him is the highest of all authority, the authority of his own experience, that after the satisfactory discharge of his parish duties, a minister may enjoy five days in the week of uninterrupted leisure, for the prosecution of any science in which his taste may dispose him to engage." All present turned their eyes towards Chalmers. After a brief delay, he rose and thus addressed the moderator: "Sir, that pamphlet I now declare to have been a production of my own, published twenty years ago. I was indeed much surprised to hear it brought forward and quoted this evening; and I instantly conceived that the reverend gentleman who did so had been working at the trade of a resurrectionist. Verily I believed that my unfortunate pamphlet had long ere now descended into the tomb of merited oblivion, and that there it was mouldering in silence,

forgotten and disregarded. But, since that gentleman has brought it forward in the face of this house, I can assure him that I feel grateful to him from the bottom of my heart, for the opportunity he has now afforded me of making a public recantation of the sentiments it contains. I have read a tract entitled the 'Last moments of the Earl of Rochester,' and I was powerfully struck in reading it, with the conviction how much evil a pernicious pamphlet may be the means of disseminating. At the time when I wrote it, I did not conceive that my pamphlet would do much evil; but, Sir, considering the conclusions that have been deduced from it by the reverend gentleman, I do feel obliged to him for reviving it, and for bringing me forward to make my public renunciation of what is there written. I now confess myself to have been guilty of a heinous crime, and I now stand a repentant culprit before the bar of this venerable assembly."

After some further remarks he sat down. The incident is characteristic of the openness and magnanimity of Dr. Chalmers—perhaps also of the indifferent taste which marred almost all his speeches. When his biographer tells us that "the power and pathos of the scene were overwhelming," and that "we shall search long in the lives of the most illustrious ere we find another instance in which the sentiment, the act, the utterance, each rose to the same level of sublimity, and stood so equally embodied in the one impressive spectacle," his language is exaggerated, and almost absurd.¹

A greater struggle than any in which the Church had yet been engaged was now approaching. Before that struggle began, Dr. Andrew Thomson, who had so ardently maintained the principles in which it originated, was removed from the scene. He died suddenly in the month of February, 1831, in the fifty-second year of his age.²

The two parties within the establishment had acted cordially together in what was called the Voluntary Church controversy, but they were to be again opposed to each other, on

¹ Hanna's *Life of Dr. Chalmers*, vol. i. pp. 3, 4, 9, 70, 92; vol. ii. pp. 9, 373; vol. iii. pp. 76-78, 208. See also Dr. Chalmers's *Observations on a passage in Mr. Playfair's Letter*, pp. 10, 11.

² *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, vol. xxx. p. 132-138. See Dr. Hanna's remarks on the nature of Dr. Thomson's influence, in his *Life of Dr. Chalmers*, vol. iii. pp. 71, 72.

those points which first divided them. The popular party, like the various Dissenting bodies, were encouraged by the result of the great political struggle in which the nation had just been engaged, and resolved to attempt a similar measure of reform in ecclesiastical polity. The most ardent of their number demanded an immediate and total abolition of the law of patronage. But this was resisted by a majority of the party; some objecting on principle, others looking on the attempt as hopeless, or apprehensive that, if the aristocracy were deprived of the influence which they exercised by means of nomination to benefices, they would not willingly submit to the burden of paying the ministers' stipends, and of maintaining the churches and manses. It was necessary that some plan should be devised which would command the assent of the whole popular party; and that which was finally adopted was a resolution to make the call of the parishioners indispensable to the appointment of a minister.

In the theory of the Scottish establishment, two preliminary steps were necessary to the filling up of a parochial charge—the nomination by the patron, and the assent of the parishioners; the former being given by the presentation, the latter by the subscription of the call. So little regard had been paid by the general assembly to the call, that, while it had nominally continued in force, the number of persons who signed it was held to be of no importance, even the subscription of a single individual being accounted sufficient. The popular party now resolved to avail themselves of this form, recognised as it was by ecclesiastical law and practice, and to raise it from an empty ceremony into a real and essential solemnity.

It is requisite to a proper understanding of the controversy which followed, to keep in view what is meant by ordination in the Presbyterian system. According to that system, ordination is not so much the consecration of an individual to the priestly office and character, as his admission to the pastoral relation with a particular flock. In this, as in many other points, the difference is obvious between a theory which virtually regards the people as the source of ecclesiastical power, and one which ascribes all spiritual authority to the laying on of the hands of those who, through the apostolic episcopate, have received a divine commission from their Lord.

In the general assembly of 1832, an attempt was made to restore the call to what the supporters of the movement styled its original efficiency; but the motion was lost by a majority of forty-two votes.

In the assembly of the following year, the discussion was renewed. Many overtures on the subject of the call having been laid before the assembly, the following motion was made by Dr. Chalmers:—"That the general assembly, having maturely weighed and considered the various overtures now before them, do find and declare that it is, and has been ever since the Reformation, a fixed principle in the law of this Church, that no minister shall be intruded into any pastoral charge contrary to the will of the congregation; and considering that doubts and misapprehensions have existed on this important subject, whereby the just and salutary operation of the said principle has been impeded, and in many cases defeated, the general assembly further declare it to be their opinion that the dissent of a majority of the male heads of families, resident within the parish, being members of the congregation, and in communion with the Church at least two years previous to the day of moderation of the call, whether such dissent shall be expressed with or without the assignment of reasons, ought to be of conclusive effect in setting aside the presentee (under the patron's nomination), save and except where it is clearly established by the patron, presentee, or any of the minority, that the said dissent is founded on corrupt and malicious combination, or not truly founded on any objection personal to the presentee in regard to his ministerial gifts and qualifications, either in general or with reference to that particular parish: and in order that this declaration may be carried into full effect, that a committee shall be appointed to prepare the best measure for carrying it into effect, and to report to the next general assembly."

It will be seen that, instead of requiring the assent of a certain number of the parishioners to the call, the popular party adopted what seemed a milder course, the requiring that the presentee should be rejected only in the event of the express dissent or veto of a majority. The moderate party were aware that the general feeling within the establishment was on the side of their opponents; and they knew that the civil power,

on which they had in former times relied, would now be indifferent or hostile. While determined, therefore, to oppose what they believed to be both inconsistent with law, and dangerous to the welfare of the Church, it was their policy to concede as much as they reasonably could. Dr. Cook proposed a declaratory enactment, "That, in all cases in which a person is presented to a vacant benefice, it is by the law of this Church, sanctioned by the law of the land, competent for the heads of families, in full and regular communion with the Church, to give in to the presbytery, within the bounds of which the vacant parish lies, objections of whatever nature, against the presentee, or against the settlement taking place; that the presbytery shall deliberately consider these objections; and that, if they find them unfounded, or originating from causeless prejudices, they shall proceed to the settlement; but if they judge that they are well founded, that they reject the presentation, the presentee being unqualified to receive it; it being competent to the parties to appeal from this sentence, if they see proper."

Dr. Chalmers's motion was rejected, but only by a majority of twelve.

In the same assembly a discussion took place in regard to chapels of ease. These places of worship had no legal parochial district assigned to them, and their ministers were not entitled to sit in the church courts. It was obvious that in theory this was contrary to the Presbyterian doctrine of parity among ministers; but it was very doubtful whether a change could be effected by the authority of the assembly alone, without the sanction of the Court of Session. As the ministers of such chapels were generally chosen by their congregations, and were disposed, both from interest and from conviction, to favour the popular party, their admission to an equality with their brethren, independently of the doubts as to its validity, was viewed unfavourably on the other side. A motion was made to admit them to an equality of privileges with the parish ministers. Dr. Cook suggested delay; and his motion to approve of the overtures which were before the assembly on the point, and to appoint a committee to consider the best mode of obtaining a remedy for the disabilities complained of, was carried by a majority of four.

The divisions on the questions before this assembly, and, still more, the line of policy adopted by the moderate leaders—the evident wish to concede as much as they possibly could—shewed that the long established supremacy of their party was almost at an end.¹

The conflict was continued in the assembly of 1834. The veto law was again introduced; and, as Dr. Chalmers was not a member, its adoption on this occasion was moved by Sir James Moncreiff, now one of the judges of the Court of Session, under the title of Lord Moncreiff. The opposition was led by Dr. Mearns, Professor of Divinity in King's College, Aberdeen, one of the ablest men on the moderate side. The report of a committee named in terms of the declaratory act of the previous session was moved as an amendment; but the veto overture was carried by a majority of forty-five, one hundred and eighty-four voting for it, and one hundred and thirty-nine against it. Doubts had been entertained of the legality of the measure by several of the popular party, and in particular by Dr. Chalmers himself; but these were removed by the assurances of Lord Moncreiff, and of the Lord Advocate and Solicitor General—assurances which were supposed not only to be satisfactory as to the law on the point, but to imply the approbation of the government.

The overture, which was adopted by the assembly as an interim act, was substantially the same as the motion of Dr. Chalmers in the previous year, and was as follows:—"The general assembly declare, that it is a fundamental law of this Church that no pastor shall be intruded on any congregation contrary to the will of the people; and, in order that this principle may be carried into full effect, the general assembly, with the consent of a majority of the presbyteries of this Church, do declare, enact, and ordain, that it shall be an instruction to presbyteries, that if, at the moderating in a call to a vacant pastoral charge, the major part of the male heads of families, members of the vacant congregation, and in full communion with the Church, shall disapprove of the person in whose favour the call is proposed to be moderated in, such

¹ Bryce's *Ten Years of the Church of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 14-18. Buchanan's *Ten Years' Conflict*, ed. 1857, vol. i. p. 209-236. Hanna's *Life of Dr. Chalmers*, vol. iii. p. 351-360.

disapproval shall be deemed sufficient ground for the presbytery rejecting such person, and that he shall be rejected accordingly, and due notice thereof forthwith given to all concerned; but that, if the major part of the said heads of families shall not disapprove of such person to be their pastor, the presbytery shall proceed with the settlement according to the rules of the Church; and farther declare, that no person shall be held to be entitled to disapprove as aforesaid, who shall refuse, if required, solemnly to declare, in presence of the presbytery, that he is actuated by no factious or malicious motive, but solely by a conscientious regard to the spiritual interests of himself or the congregation."

During the sitting of the assembly, certain regulations were passed for carrying the act into effect; and the act itself, having afterwards received the consent of a majority of the presbyteries, became a permanent law of the Church.

The question as to the ministers of chapels of ease was also brought before the assembly. Notwithstanding the strenuous resistance of the moderate party, headed by Dr. Cook, who contended that the measure was opposed to the law of the land, and an assumption of illegal authority on the part of the assembly, it was agreed, on a division of one hundred and fifty-two to one hundred and three, to pass a declaratory enactment to the effect, that all such ministers, already settled, or to be settled in time to come, were and should be constituent members of their respective presbyteries and synods, and eligible to sit in the general assembly, with all the other privileges and powers of parish ministers; and, for that purpose, that territorial districts should be assigned to them.¹

In the autumn of the same year in which the veto law was passed as an interim act, the parish of Auchterarder, in Perthshire, became vacant, and, in consequence of the dissent of a majority of the heads of families, the presentee was rejected by the presbytery. He at first appealed to the Synod of Perth and Stirling, but afterwards abandoned his appeal, and, along with the patron, raised an action against the presbytery before the Court of Session. As originally brought, the civil action was

¹ Acts of Assembly, p. 1035-1040. Bryce, vol. i. p. 18-41. Buchanan, vol. i. p. 237-296.

for the purpose of having it found that the presentee was entitled to the stipend, notwithstanding his rejection by the presbytery. But as it was a well established rule of the law of Scotland, that the stipend was only payable when the patron's presentation was followed by collation from the presbytery, the form of the action was changed, and the court was asked to declare that the rejection of the presentee, on the sole ground of the parishioners' dissent, was illegal, and that the presbytery was bound to take him on trial, and, if found qualified, to ordain him minister of the parish. Sentence was pronounced by the court in March, 1838, and the judges, without disposing of the whole question brought before them, decided by a majority that the conduct of the presbytery in rejecting the presentee was illegal.

The general assembly carried the case by appeal to the House of Lords, and at the same time agreed to the following resolution regarding the independent jurisdiction of the Church:—"The general assembly of this Church, while they unqualifiedly acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the civil courts in regard to the civil rights and emoluments secured by law to the Church, or the ministers thereof, and will ever give and inculcate implicit obedience to their decisions thereanent, do resolve that, as is declared in the Confession of Faith of this national Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate, and that in all matters touching the doctrine, government, and discipline of this Church, her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction, founded on the word of God; 'which power ecclesiastical,' in the words of the Second Book of Discipline, 'flows immediately from God, and the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth, but only Christ, the only spiritual King and Governor of his Kirk.' And they do farther resolve, that this spiritual jurisdiction, and the supremacy and sole headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on which it depends, they will assert, and at all hazards defend, by the help and blessing of that great God, who, in the days of old, enabled their fathers, amidst manifold persecutions, to maintain a testimony, even to the death, for Christ's crown and kingdom. And finally,

that they will firmly enforce submission to the same upon the office-bearers and members of this Church, by the execution of her laws, in the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority wherewith they are invested."

In May, 1839, the judgment of the Court of Session was affirmed by the House of Peers.¹

In the meantime, the popular party had vigorously carried on the various measures of ecclesiastical reform for which they had long been anxious. Referring to what was done by them during the brief but important period of their ascendancy, Dr. Chalmers said, with something of boastful exaggeration, but with substantial truth:—"We abolished the union of offices—we are planting schools—we are multiplying chapels—we are sending forth missionaries to distant parts of the world—we have purified and invigorated the discipline—we are extending the Church, and rallying our population around its venerable standard—we are bringing the sectaries again within its pale, and last, though not least, we have reformed the patronage; and our licentiates, instead of a tutorship in the families of the great as their stepping-stone to preferment, now betake themselves to a parochial assistantship, or to a preaching station, with its correspondent home-walk of Christian usefulness among the families of the surrounding poor, as the likeliest passage to a higher place in their profession, even as it is the best preparation for the duties of their high calling. And not only is there the visible glow of this great and wholesome reform abroad over the country, or in the outer department of the Church, but in the business of its courts and judicatories, in the general assembly itself, there is the same great and obvious reformation; so that, instead of the ecclesiastico-political arena which it once was, more at least than half its time is taken up with the beseeching cares of a great moral institute, devising for the Christian good and the best interests of men both at home and abroad."

It was hardly to be expected, however, that a party which appealed to the Covenanting times as the golden age of their Church—as the period from which many of its principles and

¹ Bryce vol. i. pp. 42-72, 84-86. Buchanan, vol. i. p. 340-433. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 91-103. Acts of Assembly, p. 1085. See also Robertson's Report of the Auchterarder Case.

most important rules of conduct were derived—would be free from acts of bigotry and extravagance, during the excitement of the controversy which was now going on. One of the most foolish displays of this kind was a public commemoration at Glasgow in December, 1838, of the general assembly which met in that city two hundred years before.¹

The general assembly of 1839 met a few days after judgment was pronounced by the House of Lords in the Auchterarder case. Three motions were submitted to it on the subject of the contest—one by Dr. Cook, that presbyteries should be instructed to proceed in the settlement of parishes, according to the rules which were observed before the veto law was passed; one by Dr. Chalmers, that the principle of non-intrusion should be maintained; and a third by Dr. Muir, which proposed a sort of middle course between the other two. The motion of Dr. Chalmers was agreed to by a majority of votes. The Earl of Dalhousie, who sat as a ruling elder in the assembly, foresaw the results which were likely to follow from the resolution adopted. This resolution, and the speech in which Dr. Chalmers supported it, seemed to him so objectionable, that, on the day after the debate, he announced in the assembly that he would not form part of the governing body of an established Church, which, with no invasion by the state of any of her inherent rights, and in defence of no sacred principle, but for a matter of mere ecclesiastical polity, had thus set herself up in an attitude of virtual disobedience to the declared law of the land. After adding that the Church had “already rung out her knell as the established Church of Scotland,” he left the assembly.

At this assembly, also, an act was passed for a re-union with the Original Burgher Synod. Negotiations had been going on for some time to bring about this object; and, at the assembly of the previous year, an overture to that effect had been agreed to and transmitted to the presbyteries. It was

¹ Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. pp. 90, 91. Bryce, vol. i. pp. 81, 82. See also the published reports of the meeting at Glasgow. It is not easy to understand how some of the speeches at that meeting failed to call forth some rebuke or protest from Dr. Chalmers, who, in his calmer and wiser hours, was shocked by the “cruel levity” with which Baillie referred to the persecution of Laud and Strafford. See Hanna's Life, vol. iii. p. 437.

ordered that separate territorial districts should be assigned to the Secession ministers, as to those of chapels of ease. The preamble to the act was important, as showing the opinions now held by the majority of the assembly. The latter part of it was of the following tenor:—"Whereas the members of the Associate Synod do heartily concur with us in holding the great principle of an ecclesiastical establishment, and the duty of acknowledging God in our national as well as our individual capacity; and we, on the other hand, do heartily concur with the members of the Associate Synod in confessing the great obligations under which we lie to our forefathers in the year 1638, and several years of that century immediately following, and the duty, in particular circumstances, of uniting together in public solemn engagement in defence of the Church, and its doctrine, discipline, and form of worship and government; and whereas our brethren of the Associate Synod have declared their willingness, in the event of a re-union, to submit to all the laws and judicatories of this Church, reserving only to themselves the right, which the members of the established Church enjoy, of endeavouring to correct, in a lawful manner, what may appear to them to be faulty in its constitution and government—"¹

Other cases of disputed parochial settlements had meanwhile occurred. The sovereign, as patron of the parish of Lethendy, in Perthshire, had granted a presentation in favour of a licentiate, who was disapproved of by the heads of families in terms of the Veto Act. Instead of supporting the presentee, as in the Auchterarder case, the patron here acquiesced in the rejection, and issued a presentation to another licentiate. The latter presentee was agreeable to the parishioners, and the presbytery were about to ordain him to the charge, when the first presentee obtained an interdict from the Court of Session against their proceeding to do so. The presbytery applied for advice to the general assembly; and, in May, 1838, the commission of that body instructed them to proceed with the ordination, and at the same time threatened the first presentee with ecclesiastical censures for invoking the aid of the secular power. The

¹ Acts of Assembly, pp. 1094, 1095. Bryce, vol. i. p. 88-100. Buchanan, vol. i. p. 433-472. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 103-115. M'Kerrow, p. 613-617.

presbytery, in obedience to the order of the commission, proceeded with the ordination and induction, and the first presentee thereupon complained to the Court of Session, and craved that the presbytery should be punished for breach of the interdict, by fine, imprisonment, or otherwise. In consequence of this complaint, the members of the presbytery were brought to the bar of the Court of Session, and were reprimanded by the Lord President, intimation being made to them that, if they offended in like sort again, a severer punishment would be inflicted.¹

Another case was that of the parish of Marnoch, in the Presbytery of Strathbogie and Synod of Murray. The presentee having been disapproved of by the parishioners, the presbytery, doubtful what course to take, asked the advice of the synod, and were ordered by them to reject the presentee. The presbytery complained of this sentence to the general assembly; but that body adhered to the opinion of the synod, and renewed the same instructions. The presbytery having accordingly rejected the presentee, the latter raised an action in the Court of Session, craving to have it found that the presbytery had acted illegally in refusing to take him on trial in order to his induction. At this stage of the proceedings, the decision in the Auchterarder case was pronounced by the Court of Session; and a majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, apprehensive of the consequences should they decline to take the presentee on trial, again asked the advice of the synod. The synod directed the presbytery to proceed in terms of the Veto Act. The presbytery complained to the assembly, but that court, as before, ordered them to reject the presentee.

These proceedings were further complicated by a second presentation issued by the patron, against which the first presentee obtained an interdict from the Court of Session. The first presentee also raised another action before the same court, to have it found that he had been legally presented to the parish of Marnoch, and that the presbytery were bound to admit him, if found duly qualified according to the rules of the Church. In July, 1838, a meeting of the presbytery took place, at which

¹ Bryce, vol. i. p. 73-80. Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 1-15. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 126-131.

a majority of the members resolved to delay taking any proceedings till the matters in dispute were determined. The members in the minority proposed to consult the commission of the assembly, and, on this proposal being rejected, complained to the synod. The synod remitted the whole cause to the general assembly, and the assembly, in turn, handed it over to the commission, by whom the presbytery were directed to suspend further proceedings in the settlement of the parish, unless the first presentee should give up his claim; a special prohibition being granted at the same time against the induction of that presentee.

The presbytery, having received formal intimation from the first presentee of the decree of the Court of Session requiring them to take him on trial, resolved, by seven votes to three, to give obedience to that injunction, and to report their resolution to the commission of the assembly. In consequence of this, the commission, which met in December, 1839, suspended the majority of the presbytery both from their judicial and their pastoral functions, and gave to the minority the whole power and jurisdiction competent to the presbytery.

The suspension of the majority of the presbytery, for intimating their intention of giving obedience to a sentence of the supreme civil court, rendered hopeless all prospect of an accommodation between the two parties. The seven ministers disregarded the suspension, and at the same time obtained an interdict from the Court of Session against any minister of the established Church officiating in their parishes, without their consent. The highest civil and ecclesiastical tribunals, recognised by law in Scotland, were now in open collision. The commission of the assembly was supported by the whole strength of the popular party; and the Strathbogie Presbytery had the entire sympathy of most of those who professed moderate principles. Thus, as has been remarked, "it happened that, while clergymen were flocking to Strathbogie, in order to manifest their disregard of civil edicts, others were hastening to the same district, to display their disrespect towards the ecclesiastical."¹

It was obvious that, if the dispute between the two parties

¹ Bryce, vol. i. p. 101-138. Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 17-49. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 140-150.

were allowed to proceed much further, a schism was inevitable. Many persons who were interested in the welfare of the establishment, and who wished to prevent extreme measures on either side, were of opinion that the threatened division might be averted by a legislative enactment. The popular party themselves had appealed to the government, in the hope of obtaining its support; but the prime minister, Lord Melbourne, held out little prospect of success. An attempt, however, was made by the Earl of Aberdeen to frame such a bill as would satisfy the advocates of the veto, without destroying the rights of patrons, or interfering with the due authority of the presbyteries.

These negotiations were still going on when the general assembly met in 1840. A majority of the members expressed their disapprobation of the provisions of Lord Aberdeen's bill. A debate also took place on the competency of the proceedings of the commission in regard to the Strathbogie ministers, but it was decided that that body had not exceeded its powers. The proceedings were then discussed on their merits; and, after some attempts to prevail on the seven ministers to submit, the sentence of suspension was continued, and they were ordered to appear before a meeting of the commission in August.¹

¹ Bryce, vol. i. p. 160-217; vol. ii. pp. 1-37, 53-80. Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 53-152. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 151-174.

CHAPTER LXXXVIII.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

FROM THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN MAY, 1840, TO THE UNION OF THE
SECESSION AND RELIEF CHURCHES IN MAY, 1847.

The Marnoch settlement—General Assembly of 1841—Debate regarding the Strathbogie ministers—Speech of Mr. Cunningham—The Strathbogie ministers are deposed—Continuance of the struggle—General Assembly of 1842—The Act of 1799 repealed—The Declaration and Protest, and Claim of Right—Convocation of ministers—Appeal to the Government—Preparations for a secession—General Assembly of 1843—Speech of Dr. Welsh—The Protest—The Disruption—The Veto Act rescinded—The Strathbogie ministers are restored—Lord Aberdeen's Act—The Free Church—Death of Dr. Chalmers—The Secession Church—Death of Dr. M' Crie—Proposals for a Union of the Associate Synod and the Relief Synod—The Basis of Union—The United Presbyterian Church.

THE Strathbogie ministers, instead of appearing before the commission of the assembly in August, 1840, declined the jurisdiction of that body ; and, on an order being obtained from the Court of Session, requiring them to proceed with the admission and ordination of the presentee to the parish of Marnoch, they expressed their readiness to obey. The admission accordingly took place in January, 1841. The parishioners, most of whom were opposed to the settlement, assembled in large numbers, notwithstanding the inclemency of the season. Their proceedings were carefully arranged. They called on the presbytery to say by what authority it acted ; protested against the admission ; and then, gathering up their Bibles from the pews, left the church. An exaggerated account of the event, set forth with a variety of picturesque and dramatic details, was widely circulated, and made a deep im-

pression on those who were prepared beforehand to sympathise with the opponents of the settlement.

When the general assembly met in May, 1841, it appeared that the constitution of that tribunal itself was to become one of the points in dispute. The seven Strathbogie ministers maintained their right to act as members of the presbytery, notwithstanding the sentence of suspension; while the remaining ministers, though a minority in respect of number, claimed for themselves, and the elders adhering to them, the whole powers and jurisdiction of the presbytery. Representatives from both parties appeared in the assembly. Those from the majority were refused permission to sit; those from the minority were received. In consequence of this rejection, the majority afterwards obtained an interdict from the Court of Session, prohibiting the representatives of the minority from acting as members of the assembly. Many who were not disposed to favour the claims of the popular party were alarmed by this proceeding. They could understand the power of the Court of Session to decide on the mixed civil and ecclesiastical rights depending on any question which came before them; but the assumption of authority to interfere directly, in regard to the privilege of sitting and voting in the highest ecclesiastical court, seemed to render ineffectual any claim whatever to independent jurisdiction on the part of the Church.

The Strathbogie ministers had been summoned to appear before the assembly, to answer for their conduct in admitting the Marnoch presentee, in defiance of the express injunctions of the ecclesiastical courts. They appeared in obedience to this citation; and the debate which followed brought out distinctly the position now occupied by the contending parties. The supporters of moderate principles maintained that no minister of the national establishment could be justly punished for obeying an order of the supreme civil court. Those on the other side assumed the high ecclesiastical ground, that the Church was entitled in every case to punish the disobedience of her own members; and they appealed, in confirmation of this right, to the authority of the ancient councils, and to the canons of the Catholic Church. The language of Mr. Cunningham on this point was as distinct, as it was eloquent and impressive. Referring to the sentence of suspen-

sion against the ministers, he admitted that it "might have been erroneously pronounced; and in that case disobedience to it might not have been a sin against Christ." But in such circumstances, he added, the appeal should "have been taken in foro conscientiæ, in foro Christi, against the office-bearers of the Church, and not in foro Cæsaris, who had no right to interfere, but to whom, notwithstanding, the appeal had been made. By calling on the civil power to suspend the sentence pronounced against them, and to restore them to their spiritual functions, they had renounced their allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Church. Had they protested against the sentence as passed *clave errante*, and appealed to Christ, their persevering in the discharge of their spiritual functions might not have been a disavowal of Christ's authority; for the sentence might have been one which fidelity to Christ demanded of them to disobey. But in appealing to Cæsar, in going to the Court of Session, and seeking the aid of the secular arm to restore them to their spiritual functions, consisted the rebellion for which they were now justly punishable. The course which they had pursued implied a denial that to the office-bearers of Christ alone belonged 'the power of the keys.' In interfering, as it had done, the Court of Session had assumed the power of the keys; and had thereby broken both the laws of God and the law of the land, and been guilty of great sin. And the men at the bar had been the authors and originators of all this sin. This was the spirit that characterized the whole of their proceedings, and made their offence neither more nor less than high treason against Jesus Christ. They had aimed a blow at the very existence of the Church as a distinct society, exercising functions and enjoying privileges derived from Him, and bound to be regulated in all things by his word; and they had done that which plainly implied that they had taught and held that the courts of Cæsar are entitled to exercise jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters. But he and his friends never could admit the principle, that the civil courts could interfere with their duty to Christ. They did not allow them to have power to regulate everything connected with the settlement of ministers. There were matters in this settlement which were properly and purely ecclesiastical; and because things civil

were mixed up with things ecclesiastical, it did not follow, that the civil courts were to be let into a jurisdiction over the whole matter. The examination and admission of ministers were in the Church; and whether an individual was to be ordained or not, was a matter which belonged not to Cæsar, but to God—not to the court of Cæsar, but to the court of Christ. The limits between the two provinces, which were perfectly distinct from each other, were at once ascertainable by the test, that all matters ecclesiastical are necessarily comprehended in the execution of the ordinary business of the Church of Christ, wherever that Church exists; and guided by this test, the admission of ministers was an ecclesiastical affair, and not subject to civil control. And, in the exercise of their jurisdiction in regard to it, they were under no obligation to render obedience to the decisions of the Court of Session, which was the mere creature of the state. As regarded the civil consequences of the sentence of deposition, he cared nothing what the civil courts might do. He was only bound, looking to the word of God, and the standards of the Church, to ascertain his own duty, and to do it faithfully and fearlessly. If civil consequences were found to follow the sentence of deposition, other men would be ordained in the stead of those now at the bar. If these consequences did not follow, still other men would be sent by the Church to the parishes where these men formerly laboured; and they would be supported from some source or other. If the parties at the bar were now deposed, it would be an interference with the spiritual independence of the Church if she should be compelled afterwards to recognize them as Christian ministers, or to admit the validity of the ordinances which they might administer; and to this the Church would never submit. He believed on all these grounds, that the sentence of deposition that night to be pronounced on earth would be ratified in heaven."

Dr. Chalmers, while not denying that the seven ministers had acted conscientiously and from a sense of duty, denounced their proceedings in language which some regarded as scarcely consistent with the Presbyterian theory of the ministerial office; declaring that "with a daring which he believed themselves would have shrunk from at the outset of their headlong career," they had "put forth their unlicensed hands on the dread work of or-

dination." He moved that the general assembly should find that the seven ministers had committed offences which called for deposition. This motion having been carried by a great majority, two hundred and twenty-two voting for it, and one hundred and twenty-five against it, Dr. Chalmers farther moved that they should be deposed from the office of the holy ministry. That motion having been agreed to by the assembly, sentence was pronounced against them; their churches were declared vacant; and the moderator was requested to make the requisite intimation to the patrons, in order that new pastors might be appointed. Just before the sentence was pronounced, Dr. Cook read a protest, which was immediately signed by most of the members of the moderate party. In this document the subscribers said: "We regard it as binding upon every member of a Church, as established by law, to be subject to the civil power in all matters declared by the supreme civil authorities of the country to affect temporal rights, and that for conscience sake; and firmly convinced as we are that the said ministers have acted in conformity to this obligation, and that they have done nothing which is not sanctioned both by ecclesiastical and civil law, we cannot, without violating what we owe to the Church and State, cease to regard these men as still ministers, just as if the proceedings against them had never been instituted."¹

During the twelve months between the general assembly of 1841 and that of 1842, the struggle between the two parties went on without intermission, and the excitement which prevailed among all classes in the establishment continued to increase. Vain attempts were still made to obtain a settlement

¹ Bryce, vol. ii. p. 88-172. Buchanan, vol. ii. pp. 171-207, 221-277. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 213-224. At various stages of the controversy, Dr. Chalmers had endeavoured to win the sympathy of the English clergy by referring to the attempt made by the courts of law to compel the presbyteries in Scotland to grant ordination—an attempt which, if made in England, would never be submitted to. The inaccuracy of the comparison had been pointed out by Dr. Bryce, who, in an address to the English bishops and clergy, explained the Presbyterian doctrine on the point, and said, "at no period of our Church's history, has she looked upon ordination as conveying, through an apostolical channel, and chain of unbroken succession, the indelible character, graces, and influences, of which you hold it to be the divinely-appointed vehicle." See Dr. Bryce's Address to the clergy of the Church of England, on the present position of the Church of Scotland, p. 52.

of the controversy through the intervention of parliament or the government ; but Sir Robert Peel, who was now prime minister, was as little disposed, as was Lord Melbourne, to make any effort for that purpose, so long as the decisions of the civil courts were set at defiance. Other cases of parochial appointments also occurred, in which the provisions of the veto law were disobeyed ; and various members of the moderate party showed their disregard of the late solemn deposition of the Strathbogie ministers, by joining with them in administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in their churches.

It was soon after this last occurrence that the commission of the assembly met in the month of August. Mr. Candlish, who was now generally regarded as the real leader of the popular party, drew attention to what had taken place ; making a distinction between the case of those who, acting without sanction from the minority of the presbytery, had been guilty of irregularity by preaching in the pulpits of the deposed ministers, and the much more serious offence of joining with them in the dispensation of the sacrament, as if the sentence of the assembly were utterly invalid. The argument used by the majority, at this and other times, could not be easily reconciled with the Presbyterian doctrine and practice. Their adversaries were aware of the advantage which this gave them, and pointed out how inapplicable such arguments were, when used by those who denied the peculiar character of ordination which was held by Roman Catholics and Episcopalians.

The general assembly met in May, 1842. A nobleman of high rank and estimable character, the Marquis of Bute, was the royal commissioner ; and Dr. Welsh, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh, a member of the popular party, was chosen moderator, without opposition. One of the first matters which came before the assembly, was an overture to rescind the act of 1799, in so far as it prohibited ministerial communion with all persons not qualified to receive presentation to a benefice in the established Church. This overture was agreed to ; an injunction being given at the same time to all ministers, to guard against holding ministerial communion with persons not duly ordained and not sound in the faith. The assembly also agreed to a resolution, by which they declared that patronage was a grievance ; that it had been

attended with much injury to true religion; that it was the main cause of the difficulties in which the Church was then involved; and that it ought to be abolished.

The movement, almost from its commencement, had been urged on by a majority in the general assembly and in most of the inferior ecclesiastical judicatories; it had received the support of the popular voice; if sometimes discouraged, it had more frequently been favoured by the government. But at every step the civil courts, on an appeal being made to them, had declared the recent changes to be illegal. In a Church established by law, it was impossible that a conflict could long go on, in which the supreme ecclesiastical and civil courts pronounced opposite judgments, each enforcing them by the penalties peculiar to itself. It was resolved by the popular party to make a final appeal to the sovereign and the legislature, with the intention, if that failed, of adopting the only alternative which remained—a separation from the establishment. An overture was brought before the assembly in the shape of a declaration and protest against the alleged encroachments of the civil courts, and a claim of right to those privileges to which the Church asserted an inalienable title. The claim, declaration, and protest, were met by certain resolutions, proposed by the moderate party, and embodying their opinions on the contest. The former were agreed to by a majority of one hundred and thirty; two hundred and forty-one voting for the claim and protest, and one hundred and eleven for the resolutions. The commissioner, on being requested to present the claim of right to the queen, declared his readiness to comply, but added that, in doing so, he expressed no approbation of the measure.

In the document thus agreed to, the assembly—after a long preamble setting forth the doctrines of the Confession of Faith on the points in dispute, the various statutes, decisions of the civil courts, and acts of assembly, by which these were confirmed, and the alleged invasions of them by the Court of Session—claimed, as of right, that the Church should “freely possess and enjoy her liberties, government, discipline, rights, and privileges, according to law, especially for the defence of the spiritual liberties of her people; and that she should be protected therein from the foresaid unconstitutional and illegal

encroachments of the said Court of Session, and her people secured in their Christian and constitutional rights and liberties." They farther proceeded to declare that, "they cannot, in accordance with the word of God, the authorised and ratified standards of this Church, and the dictates of their consciences, intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations, or carry on the government of Christ's Church, subject to the coercion attempted by the Court of Session as above set forth; and that, at the risk and hazard of suffering the loss of the secular benefits conferred by the state, and the public advantages of an establishment, they must, as by God's grace they will, refuse so to do; for, highly as they estimate these, they cannot put them in competition with the inalienable liberties of a Church of Christ, which, alike by their duty and allegiance to their Head and King, and by their ordination vows, they are bound to maintain, notwithstanding of whatsoever trouble or persecution may arise."

After protesting against all acts of parliament and sentences of civil tribunals inconsistent with the rights thus claimed, they finally "call the Christian people of this kingdom, and all the Churches of the Reformation throughout the world, who hold the great doctrine of the sole headship of the Lord Jesus over his Church, to witness, that it is for their adherence to that doctrine, as set forth in their Confession of Faith, and ratified by the laws of this kingdom, and for the maintenance by them of the jurisdiction of the office-bearers, and the freedom and privileges of the members of the Church, from that doctrine flowing, that this Church is subjected to hardship, and that the rights so sacredly pledged and secured to her are put in peril; and they especially invite all the office-bearers and members of this Church, who are willing to suffer for their allegiance to their adorable King and Head, to stand by the Church, and by each other, in defence of the doctrine aforesaid, and of the liberties and privileges, whether of office-bearers or people, which rest upon it: and to unite in supplication to Almighty God, that He would be pleased to turn the hearts of the rulers of this kingdom, to keep unbroken the faith pledged to this Church in former days by statutes, and solemn treaty, and the obligations come under to God himself, to preserve and maintain the government and discipline of this

Church in accordance with his word ; or otherwise, that He would give strength to this Church, office-bearers and people, to endure resignedly the loss of the temporal benefits of an establishment, and the personal sufferings and sacrifices to which they may be called, and would also inspire them with zeal and energy to promote the advancement of his Son's kingdom, in whatever condition it may be his will to place them ; and that, in his own good time, He would restore to them those benefits, the fruits of the struggles and sufferings of their fathers in times past in the same cause ; and thereafter give them grace to employ them more effectually than hitherto they have done for the manifestation of his glory."¹

In August, 1842, another decision was pronounced by the House of Lords, which increased the difficulties of the popular party. It had been decided, in the first action connected with the parish of Auchterarder, that the presbytery acted illegally in rejecting the presentee. Another action was raised in the Court of Session, at the instance of the patron and presentee against the presbytery, for damages alleged to have been sustained by them in consequence of the rejection. This action was held relevant by the court ; and, on an appeal to the House of Peers, that sentence was affirmed.

Had there previously been room for hesitation among the leaders of the popular party, there now could be none. At the suggestion of Dr. Chalmers, all the ministers favourable to their principles were requested to meet at Edinburgh, in the month of November. This meeting, which was composed of ministers only, received the name of the Convocation. About four hundred and fifty were present, and Dr. Chalmers was appointed chairman. As the constitution of this body was peculiar, so its proceedings were conducted in a manner different from what had hitherto been the usage among Presbyterians. Its sittings were strictly private, and its deliberations

¹ Acts of Assembly, pp. 1125-1127, 1130-1141. Bryce, vol. ii. p. 254-280. Buchanan, vol. ii. pp. 298-301, 345-378. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 291-299. Referring to the alteration of the act of 1799, Dr. Bryce observes (vol. ii. p. 262), "After undergoing several modifications, introducing the presbytery of the bounds between the minister of the parish, and the minister of other denominations, whom he might wish to put into his pulpit, the act of 1799, in all its provisions, was again restored after the secession, and is now the law of the Church in the matter of ministerial communion."

were conducted, not by means of formal debates, but, as far as possible, by free conference among the members. The result of their consultations was a series of resolutions in which most of them concurred. These resolutions set forth their grievances, and contained a declaration that they could not conscientiously accept of any remedial measures on the part of the State, which did not protect the Church against the exercise of such jurisdiction as was now claimed by the civil courts; and that, if a measure of the requisite kind were not granted, they would resign all the secular advantages of an establishment, while continuing to maintain the principle of a right, scriptural connection between Church and State. The day after the latter part of the resolutions was proposed, Dr. Chalmers asked how many had given their assent. On being told that upwards of three hundred had already done so, he exclaimed, "Then we are more than Gideon's army—a most hopeful omen." Stepping forward, and addressing those who gathered about him, he added, "For throwing up our livings, for casting ourselves with such unequal odds into so great a conflict, men may call us enthusiasts: but enthusiasm is a noble virtue, rarely to be found in calm and unruffled times of prosperity; it flourishes in adversity, it kindles in the hour of danger. Persecution but serves to quicken the energy of its purposes. It swells in proud integrity, and great in the purity of its cause it can scatter defiance amid a host of enemies."

The resolutions agreed to were embodied in a memorial, and were submitted to Sir Robert Peel, and the other members of her majesty's government.¹

In January, 1843, the answer of the queen's government to the Claim of Right, was communicated by Sir James Graham, one of the secretaries of state, and its terms were entirely unfavourable. When the whole question was brought before the House of Commons in the month of March, Sir Robert Peel opposed any concession to the demands of the popular party. A similar view was adopted by Lord John Russell; and a motion, that the house should resolve itself into a committee to take the grievances into consideration, was rejected by a large

¹ Bryce, vol. ii. p. 309-323. Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 386-401. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 302-318.

majority. No application was made to the House of Peers, but a discussion took place on a series of resolutions moved by Lord Campbell, which shewed that there also no encouragement was to be looked for.

In the interval between the date of Sir James Graham's letter, and the discussions in parliament, an important decision was pronounced by the Court of Session, in reference to the lawfulness of the Chapel Act of 1834. After the admission of the members of the Associate Synod into the establishment, it was proposed to assign a special district to one of their ministers officiating at Stewarton, in Ayrshire; but several heritors of the parish applied to the Court of Session for an interdict. The decision of the court was adverse to the legality of the Chapel Act.¹

All hopes of obtaining relief were now at an end. Before the meeting of the general assembly, the members of the popular party had arranged their course of proceeding. Associations were formed throughout the whole of Scotland, and subscriptions were collected, for the purpose of building churches and providing a maintenance for the ministers who were soon to lose the benefit of the national endowments. Dr. Chalmers presided over the general financial committee, and acted with an energy and success, which amazed even those who had best known his labours for a similar purpose in the cause of the establishment. The thousands of circulars which he dispersed bore the following mottoes :—"Surely I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed; I will not give sleep to my eyes, nor slumber to mine eyelids, until I find out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob."—"The God of heaven, He will prosper us; therefore we his servants will arise and build." A very large number of the middle and lower classes answered the call; the higher ranks generally stood aloof. Many of the opponents of the popular party still continued to believe and assert that few ministers would secede. It is said that the government, deceived by such statements, allowed matters to take their course, without an attempt to avert the danger. It does not well appear, however, what the cabinet could have

¹ Bryce, vol. ii. p. 332-352. Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 403-427. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 320-329.

done, without incurring even a greater danger than that which was impending.

The assembly met in St. Andrew's church, Edinburgh, on the eighteenth of May. The Marquis of Bute was again commissioner, and Dr. Welsh, as moderator of the previous year, took the chair. After prayer, Dr. Welsh rose and said : "Fathers and brethren, according to the usual form of procedure, this is the time for making up the roll. But in consequence of certain proceedings affecting our rights and privileges, proceedings which have been sanctioned by her majesty's government, and by the legislature of the country ; and more especially, in respect that there has been an infringement on the liberties of our constitution, so that we could not now constitute this court without a violation of the terms of the union between Church and State in this land, as now authoritatively declared, I must protest against our proceeding further. The reasons that have led me to come to this conclusion, are fully set forth in the document which I hold in my hand, and which, with permission of the house, I will now proceed to read."

This document, which was signed by two hundred and three members of the assembly, was of the following tenor :— "We, the undersigned ministers and elders, chosen as commissioners to the general assembly of the Church of Scotland, indicted to meet this day, but precluded from holding the said assembly by reason of the circumstances hereinafter set forth, in consequence of which a free assembly of the Church of Scotland, in accordance with the laws and constitution of the said Church, cannot at this time be holden, considering that the legislature, by their rejection of the Claim of Right adopted by the last general assembly of the said Church, and their refusal to give redress and protection against the jurisdiction assumed, and the coercion of late repeatedly attempted to be exercised over the courts of the Church in matters spiritual by the civil courts, have recognized and fixed the conditions of the church establishment, as henceforward to subsist in Scotland, to be such as these have been pronounced and declared by the said civil courts in their several recent decisions, in regard to matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, whereby it has been held, *inter alia*—

"First, That the courts of the Church by law established,

and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the civil courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions; and in particular, in the admission to the office of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the pastoral relation; and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations in opposition to the fundamental principles of the Church, and their views of the word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.

"Second, That the said civil courts have power to interfere with and interdict the preaching of the Gospel and administration of ordinances, as authorized and enjoined by the church courts of the establishment.

"Third, That the said civil courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the church courts of the establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

"Fourth, That the said civil courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the church courts of the establishment, deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry, and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probationers; restoring them to the spiritual office and status of which the church courts had deprived them.

"Fifth, That the said civil courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the supreme and other judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said judicatories.

"Sixth, That the said civil courts have power to supersede the majority of a church court of the establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a church court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in opposition to the court itself, and to the superior judicatories of the establishment.

"Seventh, That the said civil courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such courts from proceeding therein.

"Eighth, That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted

into the church courts of the establishment, and allowed to rule, as well as to teach, agreeably to the institution of the office by the Head of the Church, nor to sit in any of the judicatories of the Church, inferior or supreme, and that no additional provision can be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among the members of the Church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests, and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline in any parish, without the sanction of a civil court.

“All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said civil courts severally above specified, whatever proceeding may have given occasion to its exercise, is, in our opinion, in itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, and with the authority which the Head of the Church hath conferred on the Church alone.

“And further, considering that a general assembly, composed, in accordance with the laws and fundamental principles of the Church, in part of commissioners themselves admitted without the sanction of the civil court, or chosen by presbyteries composed in part of members not having that sanction, cannot be constituted as an assembly of the establishment, without disregarding the law and the legal conditions of the same as now fixed and declared ;

“And further, considering that such commissioners as aforesaid would, as members of an assembly of the establishment, be liable to be interdicted from exercising their functions, and to be subjected to civil coercion at the instance of any individual having interest who might apply to the civil courts for that purpose ;

“And considering further, that civil coercion has already been in divers instances applied for and used, whereby certain commissioners, returned to the assembly this day appointed to have been holden, have been interdicted from claiming their seats and from sitting and voting therein, and certain presbyteries have been, by interdicts directed against their members, prevented from freely choosing commissioners to the said assembly, whereby the freedom of such assembly, and the liberty of election thereto, has been forcibly obstructed and taken away ;

“And further, considering that, in these circumstances, a

free assembly of the Church of Scotland, by law established, cannot at this time be holden, and that an assembly, in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Church, cannot be constituted in connection with the State without violating the conditions which must now, since the rejection by the legislature of the Church's Claim of Right, be held to be the conditions of the establishment.

“And considering that, while heretofore, as members of church judicatories ratified by law, and recognized by the constitution of the kingdom, we held ourselves entitled and bound to exercise and maintain the jurisdiction vested in these judicatories with the sanction of the constitution, notwithstanding the decrees as to matters spiritual and ecclesiastical of the civil courts, because we could not see that the State had required submission thereto as a condition of the establishment, but, on the contrary, were satisfied that the State, by the acts of the parliament of Scotland, for ever and unalterably secured to this nation by the Treaty of Union, had repudiated any power in the civil courts to pronounce such decrees, we are now constrained to acknowledge it to be the mind and will of the State, as recently declared, that such submission should and does form a condition of the establishment, and of the possession of the benefits thereof; and that as we cannot, without committing what we believe to be sin, in opposition to God's law, in disregard of the honour and authority of Christ's crown, and in violation of our own solemn vows, comply with this condition, we cannot in conscience continue connected with, and retain the benefits of, any establishment to which such condition is attached.

“We, therefore, the ministers and elders aforesaid, on this the first occasion since the rejection by the legislature of the Church's Claim of Right, when the commissioners, chosen from throughout the bounds of the Church to the general assembly appointed to have been this day holden, are convened together, do protest, that the conditions aforesaid, while we deem them contrary to and subversive of the settlement of church government effected at the Revolution, and solemnly guaranteed by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union, are also at variance with God's word, in opposition to the doctrines and fundamental principles of the Church of Scotland, incon-

sistent with the freedom essential to the right constitution of a Church of Christ, and incompatible with the government which He, as the Head of his Church, hath therein appointed distinct from the civil magistrate.

“And we further protest, that any assembly constituted in submission to the conditions now declared to be law, and under the civil coercion which has been brought to bear in the election of commissioners to the assembly this day appointed to have been holden, and on the commissioners chosen thereto, is not and shall not be deemed a free and lawful assembly of the Church of Scotland, according to the original and fundamental principles thereof, and that the claim, declaration, and protest, of the general assembly which convened at Edinburgh in May, 1842, as the act of a free and lawful assembly of the said Church, shall be holden as setting forth the true constitution of the said Church, and that the said claim, along with the laws of the Church now subsisting, shall in nowise be affected by whatsoever acts and proceedings of any assembly constituted under the conditions now declared to be the law, and in submission to the coercion now imposed on the establishment.

“And, finally, while firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistrate to maintain and support an establishment of religion in accordance with God’s word, and reserving to ourselves and our successors to strive by all lawful means, as opportunity shall, in God’s good providence, be offered, to secure the performance of this duty agreeably to the Scriptures, and in implement of the statutes of the kingdom of Scotland, and the obligations of the Treaty of Union, as understood by us and our ancestors, but acknowledging that we do not hold ourselves at liberty to retain the benefits of the establishment while we cannot comply with the conditions now deemed to be thereto attached—we protest that, in the circumstances in which we are placed, it is and shall be lawful for us, and such other commissioners chosen to the assembly appointed to have been this day holden, as may concur with us, to withdraw to a separate place of meeting, for the purpose of taking steps for ourselves and all who adhere to us—maintaining with us the Confession of Faith and standards of the Church of Scotland, as heretofore understood—for separating, in an orderly way,

from the establishment; and thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence on God's grace and the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the advancement of his glory, the extension of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, and the administration of the affairs of Christ's house, according to his holy word: and we do now, for the purpose foresaid, withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things which have come upon us, because of our manifold sins, and the sins of this Church and nation; but, at the same time, with an assured conviction, that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from an establishment which we loved and prized—through interference with conscience, the dishonour done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of his sole and supreme authority as King in his Church."

When Dr. Welsh had read the protest, he laid it on the table, bowed to the commissioner, and left the church, followed by Dr. Chalmers, and more than four hundred ministers of the establishment.¹

The separation had taken place, and the long struggle was at end. The measures of the popular party had sometimes been oppressive, and their language was frequently uncharitable and unbecoming. The principles to which they appealed in defence of their conduct, though in accordance with the opinions of Melville and the Covenanters, and supported, to a certain extent, by ecclesiastical precedents subsequent to the Revolution and the Union, had only a doubtful sanction in the system recognised by Knox, and were contrary to the plain meaning and intent of the acts of the legislature. But the courage, the consistency, and the ability, which they displayed during the perilous conflict, merited admiration and respect; and the crowning act of self-sacrifice which marked its conclusion was worthy of the highest reverence.

When all those who adhered to the protest had left the assembly, Dr. Macfarlane, Principal of the College of Glasgow, was elected moderator; and the business proceeded, so far as formalities were concerned, as if nothing of importance had

¹ Bryce, vol. ii. pp. 357-360, 436-440. Buchanan, vol. ii. pp. 428-443, 485-488. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 329-339.

happened. One of the first subjects of consideration was the Veto Act—the immediate cause of the recent controversy. Dr. Cook moved, “That presbyteries be instructed to proceed henceforth in the settlement of vacant parishes according to the practice which prevailed previously to the passing of the Veto Act, keeping in view the privilege of the people to object, and of the presbytery to judge.” After some discussion, this motion was agreed to without a vote. It was then moved by Dr. Mearns, that the sentences of suspension and deposition pronounced against the Strathbogie ministers had been, *ab initio*, null and void, and that these ministers were in possession of all their rights as if no such sentences had ever been passed. This motion was opposed; but, on a division, one hundred and forty-two voted for it, and only thirty-three against it. The Chapel Act of 1834, and the act of 1839 for the admission of the ministers of the Associate Synod, were next declared to have been incompetently passed, and to be of necessity repealed; and the censures imposed on various ministers for appealing to the civil courts were recalled.

Such were the most important acts of the general assembly of 1843; and, in the opinion of one of the historians who record them, they marked an era which deserved to be called the “third Reformation of the Church of Scotland,” being “the last and most thorough emancipation from spiritual tyranny and thralldom.”

One duty now devolved on the moderate party, as important as any of the legislative labours of the assembly—the filling up of the benefices rendered vacant by the secession. Vigorous efforts were made for this purpose. Some unworthy and inefficient appointments took place—a misfortune hardly to be avoided under the circumstances—but, in most cases, the new incumbents were not inferior in character or attainments to those who had retired.

In the summer of 1843, a bill was introduced into parliament, “to remove doubts respecting the admission of ministers to benefices in that part of the United Kingdom called Scotland.” It passed through both houses and received the royal assent. The object of this statute, generally known as Lord Aberdeen’s Act, was to afford facilities for the rejection of presentees, where, on cause shewn by the people and approved

of by the presbyteries, it was decided that they were unfit for the particular charge to which they were presented.¹

While the general assembly of 1843 was holding its sittings, for the purpose of restoring matters as far as possible to the state in which they were ten years before, the ministers and elders who had separated from them met in a similar assembly, differing externally in nothing save the absence of the royal commissioner. Dr. Chalmers was chosen moderator, and it was agreed that the newly formed communion should assume the name of "The Free Church of Scotland." On the twenty-third of May, a formal deed was approved, by which the members, while refusing to acknowledge the supreme ecclesiastical judicatory established by law to be a free or lawful assembly of the Church of Scotland, and disclaiming its authority in matters spiritual, yet, in respect of its recognition by the state, agreed to intimate to that body, that the benefices held by incumbents adhering to the Free Church were now vacant, and consented that they might be dealt with as such. This deed of demission was signed by four hundred and seventy-four ministers. The principles which the new communion adopted in regard to the election of ministers, were those which they had proclaimed during the last years of the struggle within the establishment; but their doctrines, polity, and worship, were in other respects unaltered.

It was supposed by many that the members of the Free Church would be unable to maintain the position which they had assumed, and that, after the first fervour of excitement, the voluntary contributions on which they relied would become insufficient. No such falling off, however, took place. The principle of private munificence and individual responsibility, to which they appealed, did not fail them.²

The great name and unwearied labours of Dr. Chalmers overcame many difficulties, which otherwise might have obstructed the prosperity of the Free Church at its very commencement; and the few remaining years of his life were devoted to exertions for its welfare. He died on the thirtieth of May, 1847.³ His merits as an author were for some time

¹ Bryce, vol. ii. pp. 363-385, 396-412. Buchanan, vol. ii. p. 449-461.

² Buchanan, vol. ii. pp. 443-449, 462-469. Bryce, vol. ii. p. 390-395. Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 339-354.

³ Hanna's Life of Dr. Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 516.

greatly overrated. His learning was neither extensive nor profound ; and want of simplicity and of good taste is conspicuous in almost every page of his writings. Although he was the ostensible chief of a powerful ecclesiastical party, he was deficient in some of the qualities essential to eminence in such a position. But his true reputation does not depend on his ability as an author or as a party leader. His zeal, his courage, his devotion to the cause for which he was ready to make any sacrifice, great as they were, have often been equalled in periods of similar excitement. His entire freedom from selfishness or ambition, his generosity, humility, and charity, were higher graces, and have won for his memory the reverence and affection of all classes of his countrymen.

From the time of the union of the Burgher and Antiburgher Synods, the Secession Church had greatly increased in numbers and influence. It had taken the lead in opposition to ecclesiastical establishments in the controversy on that subject ; and this circumstance repelled still further from it those branches of the original Secession communion, which adhered to the old theory of the connection of Church and State. Dr. M'Crie, by far the most distinguished person among the Seceders, clung, to the last, to the peculiar principles of the denomination of which he was a member, standing aloof both from the established Church, and from the United Associate Synod. He died on the fifth of August, 1835, in the sixty-fourth year of his age.¹ All his various works contain proofs of his acuteness and unwearied research. But his name will be preserved chiefly by the two great biographies—those of Knox and Melville—with which he enriched the ecclesiastical literature of his country.

A strong desire had long existed to bring about a union between the Associate Synod and the Relief Synod. Formal negotiations for that purpose were commenced in 1836 ; and, in May, 1846, the two bodies appointed committees to make the requisite arrangements.

On the thirteenth day of May, 1847, the two Synods met together at Edinburgh. The following minute, being the last minute of the Relief Synod, was read :—

“ The synod having for a considerable number of years had

¹ Edinburgh Christian Instructor, new series, vol. iv. p. 573.

the question of union with the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church under consideration, and having long and anxiously enquired into the extent of their agreement with each other, in doctrine, discipline, worship, and government, have great satisfaction in declaring, as the result of their deliberations and enquiries, that any differences in opinion or practice which were formerly supposed to exist, and to present obstacles in the way of a scriptural and cordial union of the two bodies, either never had an existence, or have, in the good providence of God, been removed out of the way ; and that the Synods, and the Churches whom they severally represent, are agreed in doctrine, discipline, worship, and government ; and therefore, that the Synods, without compromising or changing the principles they hold as parts and portions of the visible Church of Christ, may unite with each other in carrying out the great ends of ecclesiastical association ; and considering that, in these circumstances, continuance in a state of separation would be sinful, and union becomes their bounden duty ; and that a Basis of Union has been prepared, deliberately discussed, and cordially sanctioned by both Synods ; and that, by the good hand of their God upon them, they have completed all other preparatory arrangements, this Synod do now, with fervent gratitude to God for his past goodness to the Relief Church, and for having led them and their brethren of the United Associate Synod thus far, and in humble dependence on his gracious blessing in the solemn and interesting step they are about to take, and with earnest prayer that He would pour down the rich influences of his Spirit on the United Churches, and would enable their ministers, elders, and people, to improve the privileges they enjoy, and discharge the obligations devolving on them, resolve, and hereby record their resolution, forthwith to repair, as a constituted Synod, to Tanfield Hall, Canonmills, in order that they may there, as arranged, unite with their brethren in the Synod of the Secession, and form one Synod, to be known by a name to be hereafter fixed, and may henceforth walk together in the fear of God, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, striving for the faith of the Gospel, for the purity of divine ordinances, and for the enlargement of the Church of Christ. And this Synod declare that the Synod of the United Church shall be con-

sidered identical with this Relief Synod, and shall be entitled to and vested in all the authority, rights, and benefits, to which it is now or may become entitled ; and that each of the congregations under its inspection, whether they shall adopt the name to be hereafter fixed, or shall retain, as they shall be permitted to do if they shall deem it proper, the name by which they have hitherto been designated, shall not be held, though coming, in consequence of the union, under the inspection of the Synod of the United Church, as in any respect changing their ecclesiastical connection, or affecting any of their civil rights."

The last minute of the United Associate Synod, in precisely corresponding terms, was also read.

The Basis of Union, which had been previously adopted by both Synods, was next read. It was as follows :—

"I. That the word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule of faith and practice.

"II. That the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, are the confession and catechisms of this Church, and contain the authorised exhibition of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures ; it being always understood that we do not approve of any thing in those documents which teaches, or may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion.

"III. That Presbyterian government, without any superiority of office to that of a teaching presbyter, and in due subordination of church courts, which is founded on and agreeable to the word of God, is the government of this Church.

"IV. That the ordinances of worship shall be administered in the United Church as they have been in both bodies of which it is formed ; and that the Westminster Directory of Worship continue to be regarded as a compilation of excellent rules.

"V. That the term of membership is a credible profession of the faith of Christ as held by this Church—a profession made with intelligence, and justified by a corresponding character and deportment.

"VI. That with regard to those ministers and sessions, who may think that the second section of the twenty-sixth chapter

of the Confession of Faith authorises free communion—that is, not loose or indiscriminate communion, but the occasional admission to fellowship in the Lord's Supper of persons respecting whose Christian character satisfactory evidence has been obtained, though belonging to other religious denominations—they shall enjoy in the united body, what they enjoyed in their separate communions, the right of acting on their conscientious convictions.

“VII. That the election of office-bearers of this Church, in its several congregations, belongs, by the authority of Christ, exclusively to the members in full communion.

“VIII. That this Church solemnly recognizes the obligation to hold forth, as well as to hold fast, the doctrine and law of Christ; and to make exertions for the universal diffusion of the blessings of his Gospel at home and abroad.

“IX. That as the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel—that they who are taught in the word should communicate to him that teacheth in all good things—that they who are strong should help the weak—and, that having freely received, thus they should freely give the Gospel to those who are destitute of it—this Church asserts the obligation and the privilege of its members, influenced by regard to the authority of Christ, to support and extend, by voluntary contribution, the ordinances of the Gospel.

“X. That the respective bodies of which this Church is composed, without requiring from each other any approval of the steps of procedure by their fathers, or interfering with the rights of private judgment in reference to these, unite in regarding as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto maintained their state of secession and separation from the judicatories of the established Church, as expressed in the authorised documents of the respective bodies; and in maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies, in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of the Church, or the rights of her ministers or members, are disregarded. The United Church, in their present solemn circumstances, join in expressing their grateful acknowledgment to the great Head of the Church, for the measure of spiritual good which He has accomplished by them in their

separate state—their deep sense of the many imperfections and sins which have marked their ecclesiastical management—and their determined resolution, in dependence on the promised grace of our Lord, to apply more faithfully the great principles of church fellowship, to be more watchful in reference to admission and discipline, that the purity and efficiency of our congregations may be promoted, and the great end of our existence, as a collective body, may be answered, with respect to all within its pale, and to all without it, whether members of other denominations, or the world lying in wickedness. And, in fine, the United Church regard with a feeling of brotherhood all the faithful followers of Christ, and shall endeavour to maintain the unity of the whole body of Christ, by a readiness to co-operate with all the members in all things in which they are agreed.”

These documents resembled the forms used at the time of the union of the Burgher and Antiburgher Synods. But there were some important points of difference. The exclusive divine authority of the Presbyterian system of church government was not insisted on; no reference was made to the duty of religious vowing and covenanting; and freedom of communion with the members of other denominations was allowed.

When the Basis of Union was read, the moderator of the Relief Synod, who as senior moderator had taken precedence, said, “As moderator of the Synod of the Relief Church, I hereby, in terms of the resolution of that synod, which has been read, declare that the Synod of Relief is henceforth one with the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church; and that the United Synod shall be held to be identical with the Synod of Relief, and shall be entitled to all its authority, rights, and privileges.” The moderator of the United Associate Synod made a corresponding declaration. The two moderators then gave to each other the right hand of fellowship, and their example was followed by all the members of both Synods.

At a meeting of the United Synod held on the following day, it was agreed that the name of the Church should be “The United Presbyterian Church,” and the name of the Synod “The Synod of the United Presbyterian Church.”

Formulas were prepared for ministers, elders, and missionaries, at ordination, and for preachers when licensed, and were approved of at a meeting of the Synods in October of the same year.

Thus the two religious bodies, differing in no essential point of doctrine or discipline, were happily united.¹

¹ McKerrow, p. 700-704. Minutes of the United Associate Synod, May, 1846, pp. 40, 41. Proceedings of the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, 1847-1856, pp. 7-10, 13, 21-23, 63-68.

CHAPTER LXXXIX.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE SYNOD OF EDINBURGH IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, 1838, TO
THE REJECTION OF MR. PALMER'S APPEAL IN SEPTEMBER, 1849.

The Scottish Episcopal Church Society—Communication from the American Church—Death of Bishop Gleig—Act of Parliament of 1840 in regard to the Scottish and American clergy—Death of Bishop Walker—Bishop Skinner appointed Primus—Establishment of Trinity College, Glenalmond—Schism of Mr. Drummond and Sir William Dunbar—Declaration by the Scottish Bishops—Agitation against the Communion Office—Restoration of the see of St. Andrews—Re-erection of the see of Argyll and the Isles—Mr. Palmer comes to Aberdeen with letters commendatory from Bishop Luscombe—Objects of his mission—Mr. Palmer proceeds to Russia—His discussions with the Russian clergy—He returns to Scotland—Death of Bishop Luscombe—Mr. Palmer prepares his Appeal—His appeal favourably received by the Diocesan Synod of St. Andrews—It is laid before the other Diocesan Synods—Its rejection by the Episcopal Synod.

A meeting was held at Edinburgh on the fourth of December, 1838, for the purpose of forming "The Scottish Episcopal Church Society," as provided by the fortieth canon of the late synod. Some association of this kind was absolutely necessary to provide for the wants of the poorer districts of the Church, which had hitherto been much neglected by the Scottish laity not immediately connected with them; although, for many years, they had experienced the never-failing liberality of William Stevens, Joshua Watson, the Bowdlers, and other munificent members of the English Church. The meeting was attended by the Primus, the Bishops of Glasgow and Ross, and a considerable number of the clergy and laity. The Primus presided; and all who were present concurred in the urgent necessity for making an effort to supply those wants which the society was intended to meet. The society, thus

constituted, was subsequently extended so as to embrace some other objects besides those expressly mentioned in the canon ; and it was of the utmost service in providing for the temporal necessities of the Church. Its efficiency in that respect was owing in no small degree to the exertions of its secretary, Mr. Ramsay, afterwards Dean of Edinburgh.

The canons of the Synod of Edinburgh had been agreed to by the members present ; but it was necessary, in terms of the sixteenth canon of the Synod of Laurencekirk, that, before being finally sanctioned, they should receive the approbation of the diocesan synods. In consequence of this, the synods of five dioceses, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dunkeld, and Brechin, met and approved of them. No return was made from the Synod of Ross. An episcopal synod met at Aberdeen, on the eleventh of July, 1839, and, in respect of the approbation expressed by the diocesan synods, declared the full validity of the late canons.

At the same episcopal synod, a communication from Dr. Griswold, Presiding Bishop of the American Church, dated the third of April, 1839, was laid before the Scottish prelates. It was addressed to the Primus, and was of the following tenor :—

“ During the last general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, the House of Bishops adopted the following resolutions :—

“ I. That it is absolutely essential to the proper discipline of this Church, that no clergyman from a foreign Episcopal Church should be received into union with any diocese in the United States, except he bring a regular and formal dimissory letter from the foreign bishop with whose diocese he was last connected ; and further that, when so received, he should be regarded on all sides, as having entirely passed from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop from whom the letter dismissing is brought, to that of the bishop by whom it is accepted ; and further that, in the opinion of this house, no such clergyman, or any other, passing from the Church in these United States to that in any foreign state, ought to be received by any foreign bishop into connection with his diocese, except upon the receipt of a regular and formal dimissory letter from the bishop within whose jurisdiction he was last connected here,

and that, when thus accepted, and only then, he be considered as discharged from all obligations of canonical obedience to the discipline of this Church.

“ ‘ II. That the Presiding Bishop of this Church be appointed to enter into correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of Armagh, as Primate of all Ireland, the Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Churches in the West India Islands, and in the Colonies of Canada and Nova Scotia, for the purpose of arranging, as soon as possible, a general concurrence in the above regulations, and to report to this house at the next general convention.’ ”

“ In performance of the duty thus assigned me, I have the honour to address your lordship, and request that you will be pleased to take into consideration a subject which concerns the common good of the Churches with which we are connected, and that you will have the goodness to communicate to me, in Boston, Massachusetts, what is your pleasure or advice respecting the above resolutions.”

The synod expressed their approbation of the principles and objects of the communication ; and requested the Primus, in name of the Scottish Episcopal Church, to thank their brethren in the United States for this proof of their confidence and brotherly affection, and formally to accept the rule of intercommunion proposed by the prelates of the Transatlantic Church.¹

Bishop Gleig died at Stirling, on the ninth of March, 1840, in the eighty-seventh year of his age. Before his health was broken by the infirmities consequent on advanced years, he was an active and laborious prelate, and, as Primus, was no unworthy successor of Bishop John Skinner. He was distinguished for his attainments both as a scholar and as a divine, and his talents were at all times made available for the service of the Church. On his death, the diocese of Brechin became subject to the jurisdiction of his coadjutor, Bishop Moir.²

When the penal statutes were repealed in 1792, the clause in the act, which declared all pastors and ministers of the

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 101-104. Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. i. pp. 217, 218.

² Lawson, pp. 418, 419.

Episcopal communion in Scotland to be incapable of holding any benefice in England, or of officiating in any place of worship connected with the established Church of that country, had excited considerable dissatisfaction, although, as already mentioned, Bishop John Skinner did not view the former restriction in a very unfavourable light. An attempt was now made by the Scottish prelates to obtain a modification of these restrictions. A correspondence took place on the subject with the English bishops; and, in the summer of 1840, a bill was introduced into the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the provisions of which extended to the American as well as to the Scottish Church. The bill, after some alterations, was carried through both houses, and received the royal assent.

The new statute was entitled "An act to make certain provisions and regulations in respect to the exercise within England and Ireland of their office by the bishops and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, and also to extend such provisions and regulations to the bishops and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; and also to make further regulations for the bishops and clergy other than those of the United Church of England and Ireland." The additional privileges conferred by the act were not very important. English and Irish bishops were allowed to give permission under their hand, and to renew such permission from time to time, to any bishop or priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, to perform divine service, preach, and administer the sacraments, according to the rites and ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland, for any one day or two days, and no more, in any church or chapel within the diocese of these bishops; and it was declared lawful to those to whom such permission was granted, to take the benefit of the same, with consent of the incumbent or minister of the church or chapel. The permission, it will be seen, extended only to bishops and priests, deacons not being included within the provisions. By another clause, restrictions were imposed on the Scottish clergy from which they were formerly free. The act of George the Third applied only to England, Wales, and Berwick-on-Tweed; the act of Victoria contained prohibitions against

officiating in Ireland, except in so far as allowed by the above provision; and all admissions, institutions, and inductions to benefices, in the Church of England, or in the Church of Ireland, and all appointments to curacies therein, contrary to the provisions of the act, were declared to be null and void.

It was not the fault of the English primate that the act was not of a more comprehensive character; and the boon, such as it was, appears to have been gratefully received by the Scottish prelates, who were now very anxious to obtain any degree of recognition, however small, from the state, and from the powerful ecclesiastical establishment of the South.¹

The Primus, Dr. Walker, died on the fifth of March, 1841. A mandate having been issued for the election of a successor to him in the see of Edinburgh, the clergy made choice of Dr. Charles Hughes Terrot, dean of the diocese. The election was confirmed by the Episcopal College, and Dr. Terrot was consecrated at Aberdeen, on the second of June, by the Bishops of Dunkeld, Aberdeen, Murray, Glasgow, and Brechin. After the consecration, the assembled prelates made choice of the Bishop of Aberdeen as Primus.²

In the autumn of 1841, the bishops had under their consideration a proposal, made by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. James Hope, to establish a college for the training of candidates for holy orders in the Episcopal Church, and also for the purposes of general education. The bishops hesitated for some time; but they finally sanctioned the plan, and issued a pastoral letter addressed to "all faithful members of the Reformed Catholic Church," recommending it as a fitting object for their prayers and alms. Collegiate buildings were subsequently erected in Glenalmond, near Perth, and the institution was established under the name of "The College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity;" an English clergyman, Mr. Charles Wordsworth, being appointed warden.³

The Scottish prelates had succeeded in obtaining the submission of all the independent congregations except two. It

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 105-110. Blatch's Life of Bishop Low, p. 211-227.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 111, 112.

³ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 115-117. Lawson, p. 465-470.

was hoped that, within a short period, the existence of a body professing to be in communion with the Church of England, while rejecting the authority of the Scottish bishops, would be at an end ; but, in the year 1842, a dispute took place which led to a new schism. Mr. Drummond, a clergyman of English orders in Edinburgh, who had on several occasions committed acts in contravention of ecclesiastical rule, at last attracted notice by repeated transgressions of an express canon of the Church. The twenty-eighth canon of the Synod of Edinburgh declared that, if any clergyman should officiate or preach in any place publicly without using the Liturgy at all, he should, for the first offence, be admonished by his bishop, and, if he persevered in the practice, should be suspended, until, after due contrition, he should be restored to the exercise of his clerical functions. Mr. Drummond had disregarded the provisions of the canon, but his offence was for some time overlooked. His conduct, however, having become notorious, and several of his brethren having remonstrated with him to no purpose, Bishop Terrot admonished him in terms of the canon. He still persisted in the practice complained of ; but, in order to escape a sentence of suspension, he resigned his cure, announcing his intention at the same time of setting up an independent meeting-house in Edinburgh.

The insubordination of Mr. Drummond was imitated in the following year by Sir William Dunbar, also a clergyman of English orders, who had been instituted to the charge of a congregation in Aberdeen which had lately been united to the Church. Professing to be dissatisfied with various proceedings of his bishop, he claimed the right of withdrawing from communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church, while continuing to officiate as before. The Bishop of Aberdeen was not disposed to allow such a proceeding to pass unpunished. With the advice of his clergy assembled in diocesan synod, he pronounced a sentence of rejection from communion against the contumacious clergyman.

After these proceedings, a few other clergymen of English and Irish ordination renounced their allegiance to the Scottish Church. The separatists were discouraged by almost all the English prelates ; but the Scottish bishops were not able to obtain from their brethren of the South any formal condem-

nation of the schism. In consequence of this, in December, 1844, they issued the following declaration :—

“To all orthodox bishops, and faithful people, everywhere dispersed, the bishops in Scotland send health and greeting in the Lord.

“Dearly beloved, we have considered often and deeply, and have lamented over, the sadly divided state of the Holy Church, the spouse and body of Christ, which can be but one, as He is one, and in which it was his blessed will that all his followers should, like brethren, dwell together in unity. Nevertheless, through the malice of the devil, and for the punishment of our manifold sins, that divine unity has been most grievously broken, and hence have sprung, as we have bitterly experienced, the greatest practical evils—distance and estrangement of hearts, the deprivation and loss of communion between Churches, and neglect of the laws of intercommunion where that spiritual fellowship exists; the denial by one Church of the just rights of another, or the undue encroachment upon these; contempt of the authority of the one episcopate; insubordination of the clergy; and, over and above all, coldness and indifference of one member of the episcopal body to another.

“Ever deploring these evils as we do, late circumstances have made us but too painfully acquainted with their operation in the small and depressed portion of our Lord’s vineyard, in which we have been called to bear rule and to labour. The sins of disobedience and schism have fatally risen among us; more than one priest within the pale of our Church, in the prosecution of their own wills, have renounced their canonical obedience, and put forth bitter words against the doctrines of the Church of which they had previously been admitted ministers; and one of these, with great grief of heart, was solemnly cut off from the communion of the faithful, while other two, in like manner, have separated themselves from the Church, and presumed, as had the former, to set up each of them an altar against his own lawful bishop.

“Now the Catholic Church by her sacred canons hath ever accounted such persons highly criminal, and hath forbidden her children to communicate with them in prayer and sacraments, according to the solemn warning of our divine Lord

and Master, 'if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.' And it hath been a fundamental law of the intercommunion of Churches, that the lawful sentence of one shall be recognized and respected by all others, so that he, who is cut off from communion by his own bishop, or, by parity of reasoning, who wilfully renounces allegiance to his own bishop, and severs himself from the communion of the Church, must be held as cut off from the whole Catholic body throughout the world. Thus the apostolical canon declares, that if any of the clergy or laity who is excommunicated be received in another city without letters commendatory, let both the receiver and the received be excommunicated. And, again, another canon denounces the same penalty against any one who shall pray, even in a private house, with an excommunicated person.

"These canons have been fully acknowledged as permanent laws of conduct by the Church, both in England and Scotland, in the thirty-third of their common Articles of Religion:— 'that person, which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto.' "

"Yet, notwithstanding these well-known principles and rules of duty, binding on every minister of the Church, from the highest to the lowest, the sentence and authority of our Church have been utterly disregarded, and her peace invaded by priests belonging to another Church, by which we are, as well virtually by law, as by the ready admission of her prelates, declared to be in full spiritual communion.

"I. A society in England, of which his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury is nominally at the head, while professing neutrality—a course in itself totally inadmissible in the face of an ecclesiastical sentence—has nevertheless proceeded to make itself a party, by sending its agents into Scotland, who have communicated with those persons who have set up schismatical altars against the lawful authority of the Scottish bishops; preaching in their pulpits, and receiving contributions from them for religious purposes.

“II. Other clergymen of the same Church have acted in a like uncanonical manner, sympathising with these excommunicated persons in word and deed, endeavouring to uphold and encourage them in their wicked courses, and by their example misleading weak and unstable persons into dangerous paths. And although these violations of ecclesiastical discipline have been repeatedly represented and complained of to the proper authorities, no redress whatever has yet been obtained; the ecclesiastical laws are so powerless, or so neglected, that they have no force, it would appear, to correct evils of such magnitude; and we are with pain compelled to witness the continuance of a state of things so injurious to the interests of Catholic truth and spiritual unity.

“Wherefore, we feel ourselves constrained to make this our appeal to all the bishops, faithful clergy, and people of the Catholic Church, in our own names, and in name of the clergy and laity of our communion; again requiring, with all due respect, those English prelates to whom these misguided men still profess to own spiritual allegiance, to repudiate and publicly disclaim their unseemly and uncanonical conduct; while we earnestly call upon every minister and member of Christ’s Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church for their Christian sympathy in this our defenceless position, and implore them to unite with us in sending up their prayers to the divine and only Head of the Church, that He would graciously look upon the present distracted and suffering state of his mystical spouse, heal her breaches, and restore her long lost unity and communion, that we may all be again one with each other, with one mouth glorifying God, even the Father.”

A worse evil than the schismatical separation of a few clergymen and their congregations resulted from these proceedings. Mr. Drummond and his associates, aware that the ostensible reasons for their schism would hardly bear an examination, sought to strengthen their position by assailing the formularies of the Church which they had forsaken. The Scottish Communion Office was selected as an object of attack, and all the objections formerly made by the Covenanters to the office in King Charles’s Book were now again brought forward. The plain enunciation in the Scottish Office of the primitive doctrine of the Eucharist had always been an offence

to Calvinists; and the circumstance, that it differed in various respects from the office in the Book of Common Prayer, was convenient for those persons who now affected to maintain their peculiar character and privileges as clergymen of the English Church. Several of the Scottish presbyters, who believed that the abandonment of their own Eucharistic rite would induce the schismatics to return to the communion of the Church, or at least would prevent farther separations, presented memorials to the College of Bishops on the subject. But most of the clergy, particularly those of the diocese of Aberdeen, zealously maintained the claims of the Scottish Office; and the Episcopal College declined to make any innovation.¹

Since the death of Archbishop Ross, no Scottish prelate had taken his designation from the primatial see of St. Andrews. In the arrangements made by the Nonjuring bishops in the eighteenth century, which were designed at first to be only of a temporary nature, the district of Fife had been erected into a diocese, and had been sometimes a separate district, sometimes united with other dioceses. At an episcopal synod which met at Edinburgh, in September, 1844, it was agreed to restore the ancient name; and, from that time, Bishop Torry took the designation of Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane.²

Bishop Low, finding himself disqualified by advanced age for the adequate superintendence of the four extensive dioceses committed to his charge, was desirous of resigning Argyll and the Isles, while retaining the administration of Murray and Ross. As it would have been difficult to provide a maintenance for an additional bishop, even to the very moderate amount thought sufficient for the Scottish prelates, he further offered

¹ Stephen, vol. iv. pp. 600-602, 607-610. Blatch's Life of Bishop Low, p. 265-274. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 194-205. MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 119-123. Sir William Dunbar continued to officiate at Aberdeen; but, on his being presented to a benefice in England some years afterwards, he made a submission to the Scottish bishops, with which they declared themselves satisfied, and the sentence pronounced against him was in consequence withdrawn. (MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 309-314. Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. v. p. 165. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 353.)

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 127. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, pp. 191, 202.

to give a permanent endowment from his own means to the see of Argyll and the Isles, on condition of being allowed to nominate the first bishop. The Episcopal College agreed to the offer, so far as the erection of a new see was concerned ; but they were of opinion that the canon, which gave the election of a chief pastor to the presbyters of the diocese, prevented them, even in the case of a new foundation, from acceding to the condition proposed by Bishop Low. That prelate acquiesced in the decision of his brethren ; and the dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, having been formally separated from his jurisdiction, were endowed and erected into a separate bishopric. More than six centuries before, the diocese of Argyll had been separated from that of Dunkeld and erected into an episcopal see by the munificence of John the Scot, Bishop of Dunkeld.

The clergy of Argyll and the Isles met at Oban on the fourteenth of October, 1846, and made choice of Alexander Ewing, a presbyter at Forres, the person whom Bishop Low had proposed to nominate to the see. Some objections were made to the election, but it was finally confirmed by the College of Bishops. The see of Brechin also became vacant by the death of Bishop Moir, on the twenty-first of August, 1847. A mandate having been issued for the election of a successor, the clergy met at Montrose, on the fifteenth of September, and made choice of Alexander Penrose Forbes, formerly a presbyter at Stonehaven in the diocese of Brechin, and at this time vicar of St. Saviour's, Leeds. The Bishops-elect of Argyll and Brechin were consecrated at Aberdeen, on the feast of St. Simon and St. Jude, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Edinburgh and Glasgow.¹

Dr. Russell, Bishop of Glasgow, died on the second of April, 1848. A mandate having been issued to the clergy of Glasgow and Galloway, they elected Mr. Ramsay, Dean of Edinburgh. Mr. Ramsay having declined the episcopate, the clergy again met at Glasgow, on the thirtieth of August, and made choice of Walter John Trower, rector of Wiston, in the diocese of Chichester. The election having been confirmed by the Episcopal College, the bishop-elect was consecrated at

¹ Blatch's Life of Bishop Low, p. 321-327. MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 140-152. Bishop Forbes was a grandson of Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo, and was descended from a sister of Alexander, the last Lord Forbes of Pitsligo.

Glasgow, on the feast of St. Matthew, by the Primus, and the Bishops of Edinburgh, Argyll, and Brechin.¹

At an episcopal synod held at Edinburgh, in September, 1849, a letter was read from Mr. Woolcombe, fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Its object was to obtain the opinion of the synod regarding a proposal to send a bishop, consecrated in Scotland, to the territories of Sir James Brooke, Rajah of Sarawak, in the event of such an arrangement being approved by the authorities of the English Church, and by the Rajah. The synod recorded its willingness to assist in so good a work, but declined to move in the matter, till the sentiments of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, and of Sir James Brooke, should be ascertained.²

Bishop Luscombe had continued to exercise his episcopal functions in France, though his labours were accompanied with less success than had at first attended his mission. For some time the Scottish prelates appear to have had little intercourse with him; but an event that occurred in the commencement of Bishop Skinner's primacy again directed their attention to the peculiar position which he occupied, and recalled the memory of the correspondence which had taken place, in the beginning of the previous century, between the Nonjuring bishops and the Eastern Church.

In July, 1842, there was a meeting at Aberdeen of several of the Scottish bishops and clergy, in connection with some secular business. The prelates who attended were the Primus, Dr. Terrot, Bishop of Edinburgh, and Dr. Moir, Bishop of Brechin. On that occasion, a deacon of the English Church, William Palmer, fellow of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford, presented himself to the three bishops with letters commendatory from Bishop Luscombe. The circumstances which led to this proceeding on the part of Bishop Luscombe and Mr. Palmer were the following:—

A Russian lady had renounced the communion of her own Church, asserting that she had been received into communion with the Anglican Church, by an English chaplain at Geneva. Mr. Palmer, while residing at St. Petersburg for the purpose of pursuing his ecclesiastical studies, maintained that such

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 153-158, 162-166.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 175.

reception, as the lady alleged, was an unauthorized act of the individual chaplain, and contrary to the principles of the Church of England, which had never excommunicated the members of the Eastern Church, nor pretended to convert them. The lady's husband requested the assistance of Mr. Palmer in an endeavour to bring her back to the Russian Church. In the course of a correspondence which took place on the subject, he also wrote to the English primate, Archbishop Howley, asking his opinion in regard to the real doctrines of the Anglican Church on the point in dispute, but received no reply. Mr. Palmer, at the husband's request, applied to Dr. Blomfield, Bishop of London. That prelate gave the following answer :—"If a person of good life and conversation presents himself to a clergyman of the Church of England, declaring his assent to the doctrines of that Church, and desiring to be admitted as a communicant, I conceive that it is the duty of that clergyman to admit him. Whether he is a convert from any other Church or not, is a question which concerns the conscience of the party himself, but which the clergyman admitting him to communion is not called upon to determine. We have no authorized form for receiving persons who desire to quit another Church, and to become members of ours, although a form was prepared in 1714 for the admission of 'converts from the Church of Rome, and such as shall renounce their errors;' which form has of late been used only in the case of priests abjuring the errors of the Church of Rome. Whether the Greek Church teaches doctrines which disqualify those who hold them from communicating in our Church, is a question which I do not feel it necessary to decide in the present instance."

As the lady was now residing in Paris, Mr. Palmer laid the case before Bishop Luscombe, whose answer was :—"I do not allow that a member of the Russian Orthodox Church, or of the Orthodox Oriental Churches, can be received into the Church of England as a convert, because these Churches certainly form part of the Catholic Church. I would admit a member of any of these Churches to the Holy Communion, not on the principle of conversion, but of inter-communion, supposing such member to have been rightly baptized and confirmed, and qualified to be admitted to the Holy Com-

munion in his own Church. I lament, indeed, that the Churches in question allow some things which the Church of England cannot approve; yet I do not accuse them of any heresies subversive of the Catholic faith: consequently there is no reason why the Church of England should reject their communion."

Bishop Luscombe subsequently furnished Mr. Palmer with commendatory letters, addressed "to all Orthodox and Catholic bishops," stating that Mr. Palmer had been received into communion by him, and requesting all such bishops, each in his own diocese, to admit him to communion in like manner. To these letters was appended a letter addressed to Bishop Luscombe by Mr. Palmer, containing an account of what had been done in the case of the Russian lady, and a statement of his own belief in regard to the point in dispute. The letters commendatory, with the letter appended to them, were presented to the Scottish bishops at Aberdeen, and Mr. Palmer requested their acceptance of them, in order that, strengthened by their support, he might afterwards proceed to Russia. The answer given by the three prelates to this application was, "that it was passed over in silence." "Bishop Luscombe," he was told, "might be doing very right; but it would be time enough to seek for further support to his declarations, when their sufficiency should have been actually called in question in Russia; and that then it would be rather matter for a synod; whereas they who were now present were not met in synod, but answered him only as individual and diocesan bishops."

Mr. Palmer soon afterwards returned to Russia, and presented Bishop Luscombe's letters to the Holy Governing Synod, requesting to be admitted to communion. The following answer was given to this application:—"Seeing that the British Church has never yet, by any synodal act, expressed her purpose of restoring that union with our Orthodox Catholic Church which she has lost, by disavowing all dogmas contrary to our orthodox confession; and seeing that the present letters of a single bishop, with the petition of a single deacon, as expressing no more than the opinions of individuals, are in nowise matter for synodal deliberation, the Holy Synod, for these reasons, cannot admit the petitioner to the communion

of our Church, otherwise than by the rite prescribed for converts from heterodoxy."

A discussion afterwards took place between Mr. Palmer and the Russian clergy, in regard to the principles of their communions, especially on the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church; and the question was put to him whether he was willing to say anathema to that Church, and to the confession of faith contained in the Articles. Mr. Palmer was willing to say anathema to a considerable number of points, alleged by the Russian clergy to be taught by the Articles, or to be necessarily inferred from them; but he declined to anathematise the English Church or the Articles altogether. As this did not satisfy the Russians, he appealed to Bishop Luscombe and the College of Bishops in Scotland, declaring that, if they allowed those heresies which he had anathematised to be the true sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, or evaded an answer on the point, he would return to Russia, and seek to be reconciled from the Scottish Church as from heresy.

Mr. Palmer, having again gone to Paris, received from Bishop Luscombe an approval of his appeal; and afterwards, when he was about to proceed to Scotland, the bishop gave him a commission to represent him in any Scottish synod, remarking, however, that it was doubtful whether the bishops would admit him in that capacity. Mr. Palmer also carried with him the propositions which he had himself condemned in Russia, and forty-eight propositions respecting discipline, chiefly on the subject of passive communion, which had been drawn up by Bishop Luscombe.

In September, 1846, Mr. Palmer appeared before an episcopal synod of the Scottish Church, which was then sitting at Edinburgh, and presented the letter from Bishop Luscombe, in which that prelate requested the Scottish bishops to receive Mr. Palmer as his representative. The bishops declined to accede to this request, stating that they could neither acknowledge Bishop Luscombe's own right to sit in synod, nor allow him to act by proxy—a privilege which the canons denied to themselves.

On the following day, intelligence was received of the death of Bishop Luscombe. Mr. Palmer, however, was received into

communion by the Bishop of St. Andrews, and authorised by him to act as his deacon ; that prelate, at the same time, expressing an opinion that the appeal had a just claim to be examined into, and, if found legitimate, to be heard and judged by the Scottish bishops. In order to facilitate enquiry as to the questions at issue, Mr. Palmer prepared and printed a full account of the proceedings connected with the Russian lady, and of his own position in relation to the Russian Church. The volume was entitled "An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy, and generally to the Church of their communion."

The appeal was first submitted, with consent of Bishop Torry, to a special synod of the clergy of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, held on the twenty-seventh of March, 1849. The bishop, who was then in his eighty-sixth year, was unable to attend, and Mr. John Torry, dean of the united dioceses, presided. Mr. Palmer himself was present, and laid his appeal formally before the synod. Four resolutions were proposed by Mr. Wordsworth, Warden of Trinity College, and after some discussion were unanimously adopted. They were the following :—

"I. That this appeal has legitimately arisen, and is properly made to the Scottish Church, and to this synod, in particular.

"II. That we, the members of this diocesan synod, do solemnly disavow and repudiate for ourselves, for our own Church, and also for the Churches with which we are in communion, the position that any person can rightfully claim the communion in our Churches, provided only he professes himself to be a member of the same.

"III. That the thanks of the synod be given to the appellant for the stand which he has made in defence of our communion.

"IV. That we recommend the appeal to the consideration of the other synods of the Church, with a view to the more general assertion of the foregoing or similar resolutions, and to the adoption of any other step which, upon fuller deliberation, may appear to be necessary or desirable."

The following resolution was added by the synod :—

"That we further recommend that the address which the Warden of Trinity College read to the synod be printed and sent along with the appeal to the other synods, as contain-

ing generally the grounds on which this present synod has adopted the foregoing resolutions."

Copies of the appeal having been transmitted to all the diocesan synods, the subject was again brought before the synod of the dioceses of St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, at its ordinary annual meeting on the twentieth of June; but it was agreed to do nothing further until it should be seen what were the views of the other diocesan synods.

The diocesan synod of Murray and Ross met on the twentieth of June, the dean, Mr. Maclaurin, presiding in the absence of the bishop, and the following resolutions were agreed to:—

"I. That this appeal has legitimately arisen, and is properly made to the Scottish Church, and to this synod in particular.

"II. That this diocesan synod of Murray and Ross, recognizing so far the propriety of entertaining the appeal, recommends that the subject be not discussed here at present, but that it be submitted to the general synod.

"III. That the synod of Murray and Ross respectfully applies to the Primus and the College of Bishops for the convening of a general synod of the Scottish Church to examine the nature and merits of the foresaid appeal.

"IV. That we, the members of this diocesan synod, for ourselves, for our own branch of the Church, and for other branches also with which we are in communion, do solemnly disavow and repudiate the position that no person can rightfully be prevented from taking the Communion in our Churches, provided only he profess himself to be a member of the same."

The diocesan synod of Glasgow and Galloway met on the fourth of July. The bishop delivered an address to his clergy on the subject of the appeal. He said that he could not recommend the adoption of a resolution that the appeal had legitimately arisen. In regard to the question of passive communion, he said: "I should suppose that no member of this synod is likely to dissent from the proposition that the right to receive the Holy Communion is the privilege of true members of the Church; and that the question as to who are the true members of the Church, must ultimately be decided by the proper ecclesiastical authority, and does not depend on the

private judgment, as to their own fitness, of those who may seek Communion. The only objection which I can see to our adoption of such a resolution as this, is, that the affirmation of it by this, or any diocesan synod, may seem to imply an admission that it is possible to doubt what is the mind of the Church in a matter which is too plain to admit of question. At the Reformation, the Church abandoned the rule of compulsory confession, but in no degree intended to relax the strictness of her requirements as to the faith and holiness of communicants. Under the experience of the unspeakable evils which the rule of compulsory confession had led to, she contented herself with warning her children, in the most solemn language, of the danger of an unworthy reception of the Sacred Mysteries, and with expressly prohibiting the admission of any to Communion who had not been confirmed, or who were not ready or desirous to be confirmed; but she reserved to herself the right of repelling any notorious and scandalous offenders. And we shall do well to beware of any course which would, on the one hand, lead to relaxation of the holy strictness which is contemplated by the rubrics of the Church; or, on the other hand, lead to anything approaching to that system of compulsory confession which, after experience of its enormous evils, the Church abandoned. With respect to viciousness of life, the Church seems to act on the following system:—She warns any evil liver, that he come not nigh the altar, until he have repented of his sins: she institutes no inquisition, however, into the secret conscience or private practice of those who, after warning, draw nigh; but, in the case of any notorious and scandalous offender, she repels such a transgressor from the feast which he would profane. It has seemed to me that we shall most nearly act according to the judgment of our Holy Mother, if we endeavour to frame our conduct, with respect to heretics or schismatics, by a rule corresponding to her practice with respect to offenders against the moral law. We must not only use no expressions implying that the Church can ever tolerate the sins of heresy and schism, but we must warn any who are guilty of such sins, that they are not ‘meet partakers of these Holy Mysteries.’ We are not, however, to institute an inquisition into the secret opinions or unknown practices of

those who, thus warned, approach. On the other hand, if any one, by overt and open acts of heresy or schism, has made himself notorious and scandalous for such offences, we must not hesitate to repel."

The following resolutions were then suggested by the bishop, and unanimously adopted by the synod :—

" I. That the communication from the synod of the diocese of St. Andrews be respectfully acknowledged.

" II. That from the rubrics prefixed to the office for the administration of the Holy Communion, and from other authoritative declarations, it is plain that, in the judgment of the Church, the right to receive the Holy Communion is confined to those who are bona fide members of the Church ; and that the question who are, and who are not, bona fide members of the Church, must ultimately be decided by the proper ecclesiastical authority, and does not depend on the private judgment, as to their own fitness and qualifications, of those who seek Communion.

" III. That many instances have occurred, from time to time, to show that this rule of discipline is far from being the dead letter which some have assumed it to be ; and that, without adverting more directly to the book which, under certain qualifications, was commended by their bishop to the diocesan synod of St. Andrews, the foregoing resolutions are adopted by this synod as the expression of opinion which seems to them to be called for by the circumstances of the case, and be conveyed to their brethren of the united diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, as the reply to their communication."

The diocesan synod of Brechin met on the first of August. The following resolution was agreed to :—

" The synod of the diocese of Brechin, appreciating the magnitude of the questions raised by the communication from the united diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, regarding ' An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy,' beg respectfully to acknowledge the receipt of the same, and at the same time to state that, some of the clergy not having had opportunity of sufficiently informing themselves on the subject, they must decline at this present moment expressing any opinion on the question.

“The synod resolved to take the matter into consideration at the next annual synod.”

The synod of the diocese of Aberdeen discussed the questions involved in the appeal on the eighth and ninth of August. Several motions were made, but finally the following resolution, moved by Mr. Cheyne, incumbent of St. John's Church, Aberdeen, and seconded by Mr. Webster, incumbent of New Pitsligo, was unanimously adopted:—

“That this synod approves of all legitimate endeavours to defend our communion from the intrusion of strangers and the imputation of heresy: but the synod defers indefinitely entering upon the forty-four doctrinal and forty-eight disciplinary propositions in detail, and in the meantime recommends them to the attentive consideration of the clergy.”

The diocesan synod of Argyll and the Isles met on the eighth of August. The following resolutions were agreed to:—

“I. That this appeal does not legitimately lie to this synod.

“II. That the occasion does not demand the assembling of a general synod upon the question.

“III. That the existing laws are sufficient to enforce all the requirements of the Church on the article of the Holy Communion.

“IV. That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted with the fraternal regards of this synod to that of St. Andrews, and to the reverend the appellant.”

The diocesan synod of Edinburgh had met before the volume containing the appeal was ready to be presented.

Finally the appeal was brought before an episcopal synod which met on the seventh of September. The result of their deliberations was embodied in the following document:—

“I. The appeal of the Reverend William Palmer to the Scottish bishops and clergy, and generally to the Church of their communion, which has been considered in several diocesan synods of this Church, having been now formally and officially presented to this Episcopal College, the bishops, in synod assembled, declare their decided opinion to be,

“That the appeal has not legitimately arisen.

“II. The bishops direct that this resolution be communi-

cated by the clerk of this episcopal synod to the Reverend William Palmer, and also to the clerks of the several diocesan synods, for the information of the clergy and laity of this Church.

“ III. In making this communication, the bishops, remembering their solemn commission to ‘ watch, as those who must give account,’ over the peace and prosperity of this Church, intreat the clergy to discourage all attempts to disturb the confidence which the members of this Church so generally place in her authorised declarations and liturgical offices; and to remember that any measures affecting that full communion which exists between this Church and the Churches in England, Ireland, and America, and which is of the most unspeakable importance to the cause of true religion at home and abroad, must issue in results most fatal to this great object for which our prayers are continually offered, namely, that ‘ all who confess God’s holy name may agree in the truth of his holy word, and live in unity and godly love.’

“ IV. The bishops consider that the existing documents of this Church sufficiently show her care to guard the sanctity of Holy Communion from the intrusion of unworthy applicants.

“ V. The above resolutions will sufficiently show, that the bishops, in synod assembled, do not concur with the diocesan synod of Murray and Ross in their view, with respect to the advisableness of calling a general synod of the Church in relation to this subject.”

This decision practically put an end to all further proceedings in Scotland. In rejecting the appeal, the bishops were no doubt influenced, to some extent, by a fear of giving offence to the English Church—or, as it was expressed by Dean Horsley at an earlier stage of the question, by an unwillingness “ to make a forward movement without first consulting the authorities at Lambeth and Fulham.” But there were also better reasons for the judgment. The intimate communion which now existed between the various British Churches imposed obligations on the Scottish prelates, which did not bind their predecessors of the Nonjuring communion. Mr. Palmer’s anathemas were imprudent and unbecoming; and the conduct of the Russian prelates was marked by no conciliatory or charitable disposition, no desire to abate one jot of their

own pretensions to exclusive orthodoxy, or to meet the bishops of other Churches on equal terms, for the purpose of restoring the long severed communion between the East and West.

Some time after these transactions, Mr. Palmer forsook the English Church, and joined the communion, not of the Eastern Church, but of Rome. Such was the sad conclusion of all his writings, and labours, and journeyings. The volume which records them is one of the most singular ecclesiastical records of the nineteenth century.¹

¹ See Mr. Palmer's Appeal, and his Supplementary Narrative. See also MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 142, 182-184; and Mr. Neale's Life of Bishop Torrey, p. 224-263.

CHAPTER XC.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

FROM THE REJECTION OF MR. PALMER'S APPEAL IN SEPTEMBER, 1849, TO
THE DEATH OF BISHOP SKINNER IN APRIL, 1857.

The Gorham Case—Declaration by the Scottish Bishops—The St. Andrews Prayer Book—It is censured by the Bishops—Bishop Torry's Memorial—Improvements in Ritual—Bishop Forbes's Protest against Papal Intrusion—The Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Act—Mr. Gladstone's Letter on the functions of Laymen in the Church—Resolution of the Episcopal Synod—Resolutions of the Diocesan Synods—Death of Bishop Torry—Death of Bishop Skinner.

THE Scottish clergy partook of the anxiety and alarm which were felt by many of their English brethren, when the decision of the Court of Arches was reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Gorham case. In consequence of the ecclesiastical communion between the two Churches, doubts were entertained whether the doctrine of Baptism might not become an open question in Scotland, to the same extent as it was now ruled to be in England. Memorials on the subject were presented to the bishops by several of the diocesan synods; and the following declaration was adopted and promulgated by an episcopal synod, which met at Aberdeen on the nineteenth of April, 1850:—

“To the very reverend the Deans, and the reverend the Presbyters of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Bishops in synod assembled send greeting; grace be with you, brethren, and peace, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.

“Whereas certain memorials and addresses have been presented to us from various diocesan synods, expressing much uneasiness respecting the recent decision by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council on the appeal of the Reverend G. C.

Gorham against the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Exeter, and requesting our paternal advice for the allaying of doubts, hence arising, as to the true meaning of our authoritative formularies ; We, the bishops of the Church, deeply sympathising with our reverend brethren the presbyters, in their anxiety to maintain unimpaired the purity of ‘ the faith which was once delivered to the saints,’ declare, that we do not consider the sentence, in the case referred to, as having any authority to bind us, or to modify in any way the doctrines which we and the Episcopal Church in Scotland hold, and have always taught, respecting the nature of baptismal grace. We have always held, as we were taught by those who preceded us in the episcopate, that the doctrine of the Church in Scotland is to be collected from the Scripture, the Creeds, the Articles, and other formularies of the Church jointly, and not from the Articles or formularies separately ; and that, on the subject of baptismal grace, there is no discrepancy between the teaching of the Church in her twenty-seventh Article, in the Baptismal offices, and in the Catechism. We declare then, that we teach, and always have taught, and we entreat, and, to the extent of our episcopal authority, do enjoin you, brethren, severally to teach—

“ I. In the words of our Blessed Saviour, that ‘ except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God ;’ or, as expressed in our office for Holy Baptism, ‘ None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerated and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost.’

“ II. In the words of the Nicene Creed, with every branch of the Holy Church throughout all the world, which continues in ‘ the One Faith,’ lives in ‘ the One Hope,’ and acknowledges ‘ the One Baptism,’ ‘ We acknowledge One Baptism for the Remission of Sins.’

“ III. In the words of the twenty-seventh Article, that ‘ Baptism is a sign of Regeneration or New Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church ; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed ;’ or, in the words of the office for Public Baptism of Infants, that every child baptized accord-

ing to that office is then and there 'regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.'

"IV. With the 'Catechism, or Instruction, to be learned of every person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop,' and which teaches him to say, 'In my Baptism I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.'

"V. That the doctrine of baptismal grace is so clearly expressed in the offices and formularies of the Church, as they now exist, and as they were adopted by the Episcopal Church in Scotland, that we see no need of more than the present declaration, or of adding, by any canonical enactment of ours, to the definitions of that doctrine, as therein set forth.

"All the preceding statements, reverend brethren, we teach, and, by the authority committed to us, we enjoin you to teach to the flocks under your charge, in their plain, and natural, and grammatical sense, without the intervention of any hypothesis, charitable or otherwise.

"And now, brethren, beseeching you to join with us in prayer, that the Church, over which the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers, may be kept in the unity of the Spirit, and in the bond of peace, we commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

In place of article fifth of the declaration, as agreed to by a majority of the synod, the Bishops of Brechin and Glasgow declared their adherence to the following resolution:—"That the doctrine of Holy Baptism is so clearly expressed in our formularies, that, although the fact of the late decision has given occasion for the present declaration, we do not mean hereby to assert that the language in those documents is not precise and sufficient." It is not clear what the majority of the synod meant, by referring, in the fifth article, to a canonical enactment of the bishops in regard to the doctrine of baptismal grace. No such enactment could lawfully be made except by a general synod.¹

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 199-202. Scottish Magazine, vol. iii. p. 246-249. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, pp. 357, 358. It appears that the Bishop of Edinburgh was doubtful as to the expediency of the declaration. On the first of May, he said, in a letter to the Primus, "I begin to

The same synod had under its consideration an edition of the Book of Common Prayer, recently published, which had been recommended by the Bishop of St. Andrews, in terms of a request made to him by some of his clergy.

One of the greatest deficiencies of the Scottish Church was the want of a Service Book, containing all the offices sanctioned by canon or general use. The primary authority of the Scottish Communion Office, and the use, in certain cases, of the English Communion Office, were recognised by canon. The Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and several of the occasional offices of the English Book of Common Prayer, were also established. But some of the occasional offices had no canonical authority in Scotland; others might be used wholly or partially according to the discretion of the minister; and there was no collection of the various formularies which were sanctioned or used.

The compilers of the St. Andrews Book proposed to supply the deficiency, by collecting all the ecclesiastical formularies into one volume and illustrating them by appropriate rubrics, so as to preserve a record of the Scottish offices, and of those usages which were not to be found in the rubrics of the English Book of Common Prayer. The volume was entitled "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of Scotland, together with the Psalter, or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches, and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." The following notice was prefixed to it by the Bishop of St. Andrews:—"I hereby certify that I have carefully examined this edition of the Book of Common Prayer, and that it is in strict conformity with the usage of the Church of Scotland; and I accordingly recommend it to the use of the clergy of my own diocese."

have a better opinion than I had of the judgment of our act, as I hear not a whisper against it from any quarter. I had a note this morning from one of the most protesting Protestants in Edinburgh, congratulating me on having arranged so well at Aberdeen. The declaration quieted everything in our diocesan synod, which went off most harmoniously last week." (Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 360.)

The contents of the Scottish Book corresponded with those of the English Prayer Book, with the following exceptions :—The Preface to the English Book, and the observations concerning the Service of the Church, and concerning ceremonies, were omitted. The Calendar contained the Scottish saints commemorated in King Charles's Service Book. The office for the Holy Communion was the Scottish Office ; and the rubrics to it made express reference to peculiar Scottish usages, such as the dismissal of non-communicants after the sermon, the mixture in the cup, and reservation for the sick. The order of Confirmation was that which for many years was used by all the Scottish prelates, and which was still retained by several of their number. It differed from the English office in directing the bishop to sign those who were to be confirmed with the sign of the cross, on the forehead, and to say the following words before those used in the English form :—" I sign thee with the sign of the cross ; and I lay mine hands upon thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The forms of prayer for the fifth of November, the thirtieth of January, the twenty-ninth of May, and the sovereign's Accession, were omitted.

Objections were made to the publication in various quarters, and especially by some of Bishop Torry's own clergy. The chief of these objections were, that the book was neither in law nor in fact what it professed to be, the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments according to the use of the Church of Scotland ; that it seemed to set aside altogether the English Communion Office ; and that, even in the diocese of St. Andrews, its only authority was the recommendation of the bishop, the sanction of his clergy in synod never having been asked.

The members of the Episcopal College were not disposed to overlook any defects in point of form for the sake of the practical benefits which such a compilation was calculated to afford. The bishops present in synod, with the exception of the Bishop of Brechin, condemned the publication ; ordered the book to be suppressed ; and enjoined the Bishop of St. Andrews to recall his recommendation of it.

In the month of August, Bishop Torry addressed the following memorial to his brethren in the episcopate :—

“Such a stir and flame have been excited by the publication of the book, that I deem it necessary to remonstrate with the majority of my colleagues—the opponents of that measure—in the form of a memorial.

“I think it of importance to remark that I do not proceed by way of appeal, because that might imply my admission that a competent judgment had been delivered, while I hold the proceeding, as a judicial proceeding, utterly nugatory, being *ex parte*, and in absence of those chiefly concerned in the alleged offence. The parties are all well known, and ought to have been summoned for the purpose of defending themselves.

“It will be difficult to find an apology for taking up the question in absence of the parties concerned, namely, those presbyters who entreated their bishop, by a written and signed address, that such a book might be published as an authentic record of the venerable usages of our Church, which have the sanction and example of purely primitive antiquity, and indicate nothing erroneous or superstitious.

“I therefore thought myself justified in yielding to the request of six presbyters of my diocese, deeming their request reasonable, and foreseeing no trouble likely to arise from it to myself, to them, or to the Church.

“It ought never to be forgotten that the episcopacy of Scotland is a diocesan, and not a college episcopacy, like what existed in this country upwards of one hundred years ago. It was tried too long, and found wanting, and therefore was completely relinquished; and it is not to be forgotten that there is no principle (bearing on church discipline) against which the Church has more carefully guarded, in my day, than the assumption of anything like archiepiscopal authority. In the review of this painful matter, I feel compelled—in justice to myself, as a diocesan bishop, and in justice to those of my clergy who, from the purest love of their Church, projected the edition of the Scottish Book of Common Prayer—to call on my colleagues to revoke their sentence in reference to it, delivered at Aberdeen, during the synod holden there from the seventeenth to the nineteenth of April this year.

“And whereas the majority of the bishops, there and then convened, were induced to act in this matter, with an entire

disregard of the requisite form of legal proceedings, I further say, that they will best consult their own credit in their judicial character, by at once recalling their sentence, and thereby meriting the credit of restoring and confirming truth, peace, and harmony amongst us."

The various diocesan synods, particularly the synod of Dr. Torry's own diocese, having expressed their disapprobation of the book, an episcopal synod, which met at Edinburgh on the fifth of September, renewed its former expression of opinion, and again enjoined the bishop to withdraw his sanction and recommendation. The synod also issued an address to the members of the Church, in which, referring to disputed questions of ritual, they said :—"The bishops would not have thought it necessary to advert specially to this subject, had it not now become even too notorious that a Prayer Book has been published with the sanction of the Bishop of St. Andrews, purporting to be the Prayer Book according to the use of the Church of Scotland, although it contains rubrics which have been sanctioned neither by our general synod, nor even by the Episcopal College, and does not contain that office for the administration of the Holy Communion which is actually used, under the sanction of the canons, by a large proportion of the congregations of this Church. The fact that such a Prayer Book had been prepared, and even printed and issued, without their knowledge or authority, became known to the bishops immediately before the synod in April at Aberdeen; and, with this book actually before them, the bishops passed a resolution, which they trusted would have checked its farther issue, and would have awakened those who had been engaged in so unwarranted an act, to a sense of the most lamentable forgetfulness which they had shown of what was due to the constituted authorities of this Church. The bishops lament that, in defiance of this resolution, the book has been actually advertised and sold. It remains, therefore, for them only to declare solemnly, as the synod of bishops of this Church, that the book, in its present form and character, has no synodical or canonical authority, and is not, what it purports and pretends to be, the Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Church of Scotland. So far as the faithful members of this Church respect the counsel of their

spiritual fathers, they will abstain from using or countenancing the said pretended Prayer Book, the publication of which the bishops most deeply lament as the needless introduction of a new element of division and disagreement."

Not content with this condemnation, the Scottish bishops addressed a circular to the archbishops and bishops of the Anglican communion, in which they intimated that the St. Andrews Book was not the Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Church in Scotland; that it possessed no canonical authority; and that neither the College of Bishops nor the Church at large was answerable for its publication. In these proceedings of his colleagues, the Bishop of Brechin, as before, refused to concur.¹

The increasing pressure of age and infirmity induced Bishop Low to request the appointment of a coadjutor in the diocese of Murray and Ross. A mandate having been issued, the clergy met at Elgin on the second of October. The votes were equally divided between Mr. Robert Eden, rector of Leigh in the county of Essex, and Mr. James Mackay, a presbyter in Inverness; and the difficulty thus caused was aggravated by the conduct of Mr. Maclaurin, dean of the diocese, who abandoned the Scottish Church, and joined the Roman communion a few days after the meeting for the election. The College of Bishops declined to confirm either of the two clergymen nominated.

Bishop Low having resigned the diocese absolutely on the nineteenth of December, the clergy again met at Elgin, on the twenty-first of January, 1851, and made choice of Mr. Eden by a majority of votes. The election was confirmed by the Episcopal College; and, on the ninth of March, being Quadragesima Sunday, the bishop-elect was consecrated at Edinburgh by the Primus, and the Bishops of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Argyll.

Bishop Low died on the twenty-sixth of January, 1855.²

For reasons which have already been explained, the revival

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 203, 204, 211-221. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 273-293.

² MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 223-226, 240, 241. Blatch's Life of Bishop Low, pp. 342-345, 376. Scottish Magazine, vol. iii. p. 532-536, and new series, vol. i. pp. 92, 146, 198, 199. Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. i. pp. 10, 36, 57-59.

of primitive doctrine in the Episcopal Church had not been accompanied by any corresponding improvement in ritual, or in the forms of worship. During the primacy, however, of Bishop Skinner, much was done to effect a restoration in those respects. The canon of the Synod of Edinburgh which enjoined that, in the performance of Morning and Evening Service, the words and rubrical directions of the English Liturgy should be strictly adhered to, had prepared the way for a reform. At the date of the meeting of that synod, there was no cathedral or collegiate church, not even a college chapel, to supply a model for the more frequent and solemn celebration of divine service. In the various congregations the offices were said, not in conformity with any definite rule, but according to the taste of the incumbents, or the wishes of the people; and the irregularities were still in many cases as great, as when Bishop Gleig complained that he could not officiate for some of his own clergy, without taking a lesson from them how to read. Few of the churches—or chapels as they continued to be generally styled—were consecrated; and only a very small number of them had been erected with any attention to ecclesiastical propriety, or architectural beauty. In none of them were the services choral; in none were the Morning and the Evening Prayer said daily; in none was the Eucharist celebrated oftener than once a month, while in several it was almost as rare an event as the communion in the churches of the establishment.

A great change for the better gradually took place. New and appropriate churches were built and consecrated; the ancient ecclesiastical music was cultivated; and the Daily Service was restored in many places, along with a more frequent and solemn celebration of the Eucharist. All this was done, rather with the permission of the bishops, than with their approbation or encouragement. The most important steps were carried through by the exertions of several of the presbyters, and through the support of generous individuals among the laity.

The first church, in which an example was given of ecclesiastical magnificence and ritual correctness, was that of St. John the Evangelist at Jedburgh, which was consecrated on the fifteenth of August, 1844. Yet more important was the erection of the cathedral church of St. Ninian at Perth. Not-

withstanding many difficulties, the founders of that institution succeeded in the partial accomplishment of their design. The choir and transepts, and a portion of the nave, were consecrated on the eleventh day of December, 1850. It was the first Scottish cathedral which had been consecrated since the Reformation—the only one indeed in Britain, since that era, with the exception of St. Paul's at London.¹

When Pope Pius IX., in the year 1850, sanctioned the establishment of a Roman hierarchy in opposition to the bishops who filled the sees of the English Church, it was rumoured that a similar measure was contemplated in connection with the Scottish dioceses. This led to the following protest by the Bishop of Brechin:—

“Whereas we, Alexander, by divine permission, Bishop of Brechin, have ever faithfully endeavoured to teach the faith once delivered to the saints, as contained in Holy Scripture, and defined by the oecumenical synods of the undivided Church;

“And whereas it is a principle of ecclesiastical order that one bishop shall not trample upon another bishop—that all bishops, whether of great or small sees, are of one order and rank—and that the intrusion of a strange prelate into an already occupied see is a high crime, violating the great law of unity, and rending the vesture of Christ;

“And whereas we have heard, with very deep sorrow, that the Bishop of Rome is about to intrude prelates of his own nomination into the sees which we and our brethren now occupy;

“We, the bishop aforesaid, do protest against this assumption of power, as contrary to the sacred canons of the Church, and to the law of our Lord.”

The Dean of Brechin and several of the clergy presented an address to their bishop, in which they thanked him for putting forth the protest, and expressed their concurrence in it. The bishop sent a reply in the following terms:—

“The assurance of your affectionate attachment, conveyed in the address which I have now the pleasure to acknowledge,

¹ Stephen, vol. iv. p. 616-618. Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, pp. 307-315, 343-349, 362, 363, 367-371. Scottish Magazine, vol. i. p. 36-39, and new series, vol. i. p. 31-36. Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. i. pp. 35, 36.

has been a very great comfort to me in this season of anxiety.

"It strengthens me to know that I am assisted by your prayers, which you assiduously offer on my behalf at the throne of grace. I thank you for this work of charity, and beseech you not to cease in these intercessions, that I may have grace given me fitly to discharge the solemn responsibilities of my holy office.

"I feel gratified that you approve of the protest which I have thought it my duty to issue, and which you have made your own by your cordial concurrence in it; and I rejoice to receive this assurance of your unshaken adherence to the doctrine and discipline of the Church, as embodied in the offices, articles, and canons, and of your determination, agreeably to your ordination vows, the Lord being your helper, to give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as 'this Church hath received the same.'

"It is due to you, my brethren, that I should mention to you some of the reasons why I put my protest in the form I did.

"I. I esteem the deliberate language of hatred, indignation, and scorn, which has been lately used in reference to the papal aggression, as essentially sinful. Men have too completely forgotten that the 'anger of man worketh not the righteousness of God,' and that 'vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, I will repay.'

"II. A definite act, like the recent appointment of bishops, called for a definite reclamation, and that definite act being one of purely ecclesiastical arrangement, it seemed right that the protest against it should allude to that only, and did not necessitate any statement of our own orthodoxy. Against the errors in the Roman communion, our subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles, and our acceptance of the oath of supremacy, are standing protests. They bind our consciences as much now as on the day on which we subscribed them. To the imposing of any unauthorized tests I have a conscientious objection.

"III. It appeared to me that, except on the ecclesiastical grounds on which we protested, we, the members of a Church which was deprived of its position as an establishment by the

overthrow of the house of Stewart, and which, since that time, has existed as a purely spiritual body, enacting and altering its own laws, irrespective of any earthly head, nay, acknowledging as its only Head our blessed Saviour in his glorified manhood, could, with an ill grace, protest against the act of another communion, which act, by their own laws, they were quite competent to perform.

“In a time of great excitement, moderate measures find acceptance with few persons; and yet quietness and confidence prevail in the end. When the present difficulties are over, I think that you will have reason to be satisfied with the course you have taken.

“May the Almighty God pour upon you the riches of his grace; may He bless and keep you, and bring you to everlasting life, though Jesus Christ our Lord.”

The design of intruding Roman prelates into the Scottish sees, if really entertained, was soon abandoned, but the temporal interests of the Church were seriously threatened by the consequences of the papal measure in England. The provisions of a bill brought into parliament by the queen's ministers, for the purpose, as was alleged, of checking the encroachments of the Roman hierarchy, were of such a nature as to expose the Scottish bishops to the penalties which were directed against the intrusive prelates in England. At an episcopal synod, which met at Aberdeen in February, 1851, the bishops drew up a petition to parliament, and pointed out the injustice of punishing innocent persons for an act committed by others, with which they had not the least sympathy. The remonstrances made on the subject were successful; and a clause was inserted in the Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Act, which protected the Scottish bishops from any of the provisions of the statute, while, at the same time, it was expressly declared that such exemption should not infer a right in these bishops to assume or use any titles which they were not then by law entitled to assume or use.

This threatened attack on the privileges of the Scottish episcopate, and the somewhat ungracious manner in which it was withdrawn, were little creditable to the government. Whatever other faults the bishops, and the communion over which they presided, may have had, want of submission or of

respect to the civil power could not be reckoned among them. From the time of the repeal of the penal laws, the sovereigns of the house of Hanover had not more loyal and obedient subjects in their dominions than the Scottish clergy and laity.¹

Nearly thirty years had elapsed since Dean Skinner had proposed that the laity should be admitted to a share in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Attention was again directed to that subject, in the year 1852, by the publication of a letter addressed to the Primus by Mr. Gladstone, "On the functions of Laymen in the Church." Mr. Gladstone pointed out the disadvantages to which the Church was exposed in consequence of the want of any regular and authorized co-operation of the laity ; and he proposed, as a just and expedient reform, that a third chamber, consisting of lay representatives, should be added to the legislative synod. On this point he made the following suggestions :—

"First, That the synod or assembly for legislation should consist of three houses or chambers—the first that of the bishops, the second that of the clergy, the third that of the laity. It might deserve consideration, whether the second and third of these, of course voting separately, should, either permanently or for a time, sit and deliberate together on certain or on all occasions.

"Secondly, That the lay representative system should be based exclusively upon an ecclesiastical qualification, and not upon a pecuniary franchise in any form : in other words, that communicants only should be either eligible or electors. But, I may add, it might be found necessary first to limit this privilege somewhat further,—by age, and by requiring persons to have been communicants for a certain space of time antecedent to it sexercise, in order to exclude all electioneering practices from the precincts of the Church. And further, a different rule might still be required for the settlement of questions of temporal or proprietary right in particular congregations, and for the protection of all vested interests.

¹ MS. Register of the College of Bishops, vol. ii. p. 228-237. Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. i. pp. 16, 58, 60, 61. Scottish Magazine, new series, vol. i. pp. 90-92, 146-149.

“Thirdly, That the mode of procedure should not be to constitute arbitrarily, so to speak, a central organization, before providing local institutions fitted to give a broad and solid groundwork, but to take the local institutions first. That is to say, to begin by inviting the clergy of the various incumbencies, in conjunction with the principal members of their congregations, to frame, where such a thing does not exist already, lists of such persons of given age as have been communicants for a certain time ; to make provisional arrangements for the preservation and due correction of such lists ; and to move those on each list to choose from among themselves delegates for a diocesan synod, should the ordinary think fit to hold one, and should it be deemed wise to obtain the sense of the diocesan synods thus constituted as consultative assemblies only, on the intended measure, before its taking effect. Or otherwise, to give their suffrages directly, in common with the communicants of every other congregation thinking fit to act on the said invitation, for duly qualified persons to represent them in any general synod of the Church.

“Fourthly, As the governing power over the Church resides most properly and strictly in the bishops, and as they are supremely responsible in particular for the decision of doctrine, I cannot but express the strongest conviction, that the initiative of all legislation should rest with them absolutely and exclusively ; and that it should be competent to either of the other chambers to approach them spontaneously in the way of petition only. Their veto would, of course, remain complete ; and, between these two powers duly carried through the whole scheme, I hope adequate provision would have been made for preventing collision between such a constitution, and the great and immoveable principles of our ecclesiastical polity.”

This letter excited deep interest both among the clergy and the laity. The feeling was very general among the latter in favour of some such plan as was recommended ; the former were divided in opinion. The question was formally taken up by an episcopal synod which met at Edinburgh on the twentieth of April, and the following resolution was agreed to by a majority of the bishops :—“That the admission of the

laity into ecclesiastical synods, under certain conditions, and to speak and vote therein on a large class of ecclesiastical questions, is not inconsistent with the word of God, and is not contrary to that pure constitution of the Church, to which it has been the special privilege of the Church in Scotland to bear testimony." A copy of this resolution was ordered to be transmitted to the deans of the several dioceses for the information of the clergy.

The subject was discussed at the various diocesan synods. The first which met was that of St. Andrews. Mr. Wordsworth proposed the following resolutions :—

"First, That, whereas our Code of Canons recognizes three kinds of ecclesiastical synods, viz., episcopal, diocesan, and general, it is not competent for the Church to pass a law for the admission of laymen to sit as constituent members of, and vote in, the two former, viz., episcopal and diocesan synods.

"Second, That whether, or how far, it may be lawful and expedient to admit lay members into general synods, is a question which a general synod alone is competent to decide, and upon which this synod, in the absence of its bishop, declines to pronounce any definite opinion."

The members of the synod, not being able to come to any determination, postponed the further discussion of the subject. The Synod of Murray, in the month of June, adopted, by a majority, the following resolution :—"That the presbyters of this diocese respectfully assent to the conclusion arrived at by the Episcopal College, to the effect that it is not inconsistent with the word of God, and is not contrary to the pure constitution of the Church, to admit the laity into ecclesiastical synods, under certain conditions, and to speak and vote therein, on a large class of ecclesiastical questions. But, at the same time, they would express themselves as very doubtful as to its expediency."

The Synod of Aberdeen met in August. The following resolutions were proposed by Mr. Cheyne, and agreed to by a great majority :—

"First, That the constitution of ecclesiastical synods, diocesan, provincial, and general, having been fixed by the ancient law and immemorial usage of the Church, and no clear instance

having been produced, from past history, of lay Christians forming constituent members of such synods, it is the opinion of this synod, that it is not competent for a particular Church to innovate upon a custom so ancient and universal.

“Second, That this synod is of opinion that, under the existing circumstances of our Church, it may be lawful, if the rulers of the Church deem it expedient, to form a mixed convocation or convention of clergy and laity, to deliberate upon, and decide, with the concurrence of both orders, such questions relating to ecclesiastical government, and the temporal concerns of the Church, as do not trench upon the divinely constituted order, by which definitions of doctrine, and the power of the keys, are reserved to the appointed rulers of Christ’s kingdom.”

The Synod of Brechin met in August. The votes of the presbyters were equally divided between two resolutions—one, “That the synod does not see in the present circumstances of the Church any necessity for altering the constitution of her synods, by the admission of laymen as members of the same,”—the other, “That this synod, while recognizing the importance of the co-operation of the laity, is nevertheless of opinion, that the present constitution and powers of the several synods of the Church of Scotland should remain unaltered.” The second of these resolutions was approved of, and declared by the bishop to be carried.

The Synod of Argyll and the Isles also met in the same month. The majority of the members expressed an opinion, that the admission of the laity into ecclesiastical synods was, under due regulation, proper in itself, and likely to be productive of important benefits to the Church.

The Synod of Glasgow and Galloway met in September, and the following resolution was agreed to by a majority of the clergy:—“That this synod concurs with the general terms of the episcopal resolution; but, in expressing this concurrence, they would guard themselves from conceding, in any degree, that it is in accordance with Scripture and antiquity for the laity to vote on any questions which involve doctrine, or on the question, what is, and what is not doctrine.”

The Synod of Edinburgh met in May, 1853, and, on the motion of Dean Ramsay, unanimously adopted the following

resolution :—" That this synod now beg to offer their respectful acknowledgments to the bishops, for their kindness in communicating to the deans the deliverance of the Episcopal College, on the question of admitting lay delegates as members of diocesan or of general synods. That, having weighed what has been advanced in favour of such admission, and also what has been urged both against the principle and against the expediency of such a measure, the Synod of Edinburgh, while they deem it needless to enter upon a deliberation on the question at present, would at the same time express their conviction, that the suitable place for considering the subject would be in a general synod ; and they venture to express a hope that, whenever such synod shall be summoned, the first question brought before it for deliberation shall be the future constitution of all our ecclesiastical synods, and that there shall be a full and careful examination of the question, as involving the use to be made of the lay element in discussions and enactments on points which concern the welfare of the whole Church."

The question continued to be discussed ; but, as the bishops did not think it advisable to summon a general synod, nothing farther was done.¹

Dr. Torry, Bishop of St. Andrews, died at Peterhead on the third of October, 1852, in the eighty-ninth year of his age. His body was carried to Perth, and interred on the north side of the altar of St. Ninian's cathedral. During the whole of his long episcopate, Bishop Torry had been assiduous in the discharge of the duties of his office ; but his latter years especially were marked by a zealous and courageous maintenance of the ecclesiastical principles which he inherited from the bishops of the previous century. It was entirely in accordance with those principles, that he resisted every attempt to interfere with the primary authority of the proper Communion Office of the Church. But he did not allow the mere influence of habit, and of early associations, to deter him from giving his support to the introduction of a higher and better ritual than had before existed in Scotland.²

¹ Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. ii. pp. 112, 163, 164, 186, 187, 210, 232 ; vol. iii. pp. 90, 91. Scottish Magazine, new series, vol. ii. pp. 294, 353, 354, 405, 447, 448, 451, 499, 500 ; vol. iii. p. 245.

² Neale's Life of Bishop Torry, p. 384-386. Scottish Magazine, new series, vol. ii. p. 535-539. Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. ii. pp. 225, 231.

A mandate for the election of a bishop having been issued by the Episcopal College, the clergy of St Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, met at Cupar-Angus on the tenth of November. The Bishop of Murray, and Mr. Wordsworth, Warden of Trinity College, were nominated to the vacant see; and the latter was elected by a majority of one, the warden on that occasion voting in his own favour. In consequence of an informality in the proceedings, a new election became necessary; Mr. Wordsworth, however, having previously intimated that he intended, *pro ea vice*, to withdraw the vote which he had given, in order that another election might take place. The clergy again met on St. Andrew's day at Cupar in Fife. Mr. Wordsworth, and Dr. Suther, a presbyter in Edinburgh, were nominated. The warden was elected by a majority of one, that majority as before including his own vote. For this and other reasons, the minority protested against the election. Their objections were disallowed; and the election was declared to be valid, and was confirmed by the Episcopal College, four of the bishops also expressing an opinion that the conduct of the warden was not only legally justifiable, but morally right and blameless. On the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul in the following year, the bishop-elect was consecrated at Aberdeen by the Primus, and the Bishops of Edinburgh and Glasgow.¹

Several years passed over during which no event occurred calling for particular notice. It was a period of quietness and prosperity, such as the Scottish Church had seldom experienced; and there was no appearance of any outward calamity or internal discord likely to prevent the continuance of that happy time. While all seemed so fair and auspicious, the aged Primus was taken to his rest. He died at Aberdeen, on the fifteenth day of April, 1857, in the seventy-ninth year of his age, and the forty-first of his episcopate.

¹ Scottish Magazine, new series, vol. ii. pp. 585-601, 604-606; vol. iii. p. 102. Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, vol. ii. pp. 258-261, 277, 278; vol. iii. pp. 10, 11, 43.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

SINCE the first volume of this work was printed, I have seen an article on the lately discovered manuscript, "The Book of Deir," in the Saturday Review of 8th December, 1860, containing a Latin charter of King David I., and English translations of various Celtic memorials, preserved in that manuscript; and I have also referred to the reprint of these documents in the fourth volume of the Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff. Still more recently, I have been able to consult the valuable edition of the Chronicle of Man, by Professor Munch, published at Christiania in 1860. From these sources the following additions and corrections are derived.

From a grant to the church of Deer by Gartnait Mac Cannech, and Ete, daughter of Gillemichel, dated about 1132 (Article in the Saturday Review, and Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, vol. iv. p. 548), it appears that Cormac was still Bishop of Dunkeld in 1131 or 1132, and that the statement of Fordun as to the date of the death of Queen Matilda of Scotland, formerly quoted (*supra*, vol. i. pp. 265, 266) is not to be relied on.

From King David's charter to the clergy of Deer, dated about 1150 (Article in the Saturday Review, and Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff, vol. iv.

pp. 549, 550), it is certain that Samson was Bishop of Brechin in the end of the reign of David. I had not previously seen his name in any record earlier than the reign of David's grandson and successor, Malcolm IV. (See above, vol. i. pp. 267, 268.)

A bull of Pope Innocent III., dated the ninth of December, 1203, and printed by Professor Munch (appendix to his edition of the Chronicle of Man, pp. 152, 153), is addressed to Celestine, Abbot of St. Columba of Hy, and his brethren of the monastery. This Celestine is undoubtedly the Cellach of the Irish Annalists, of whom a notice was formerly given (*supra*, vol. i. p. 299). The bull sets forth that the Pope, listening to the request of the abbot and monks, had taken their monastery under his protection, and confirmed its privileges and possessions. Among the latter are specified the islands of Iona, Mull, Colonsay, Oronsay, Canna, and Calve. The bull also speaks of the monastic order at Iona as established according to the rule of St. Benedict, and declares, in the usual style of such documents, that, on the death of the abbot or any of his successors, no one shall be put in their place, unless chosen by common consent of the brethren, in accordance with the rule of St. Benedict.

This bull seems to throw light on the obscure remarks of the Annalists. It is probable that Cellach was endeavouring to introduce the Benedictine rule in place of the ancient usages of Iona, and that he was in consequence deposed by the heads of the Irish houses, who appointed Awley O'Ferghail abbot in his room. This substantially agrees with the explanation given by Lanigan (*Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, vol. iv. p. 347).

A bull of Pope Innocent IV., dated the twenty-second of April, 1247 (appendix to the Chronicle of Man, pp. 157, 158), is addressed "Abbati venerabilis monasterii Sancti Columbæ, ordinis Sancti Benedicti, Sudreyensis diocesis." It speaks of the abbot having come to the Pope (probably to Lyons, where the bull is dated), from a far-distant region of Norway, in which, as he said, his monastery was situated—"a longinqua nobis Norwegiæ regione, in qua tuum, sicut

asseris, est monasterium constitutum, personaliter ad præsentiam nostram accedens ; ” and, as a special favour on this account, it confers on him and his successors the right to use the ring and the mitre, and, in the absence of the legate of the apostolic see, the archbishop, and the bishop, to give the solemn benediction to clergy and people, in their own and other Benedictine monasteries, and in secular churches subject to Iona.

This bull shews that the Benedictine rule was now completely established at Iona. Its notice of the diocese in which the monastery was situated is apparently inconsistent with the statements of Bower and Mylne, formerly quoted (*supra*, vol. i. pp. 370, 371), that certain of the Abbots of Iona yielded obedience, not to the Bishops of the Isles, but to those of Dunkeld. It shews, at all events, that the inference drawn by me from those statements, as to the rule of the monastery in this respect, is erroneous.

It has been mentioned (*supra*, vol. i. p. 324), on the authority of the Chronicle of Man, that Simon, who was Bishop of Man in the first half of the thirteenth century, founded the church of St. German. The opinion of Professor Munch (notes to the Chronicle of Man, p. 142), that the chapter of Man, which is referred to in the Chronicle immediately afterwards, and to which no allusion is previously made, was established at the same time by Bishop Simon, has every appearance of probability to support it. There is much obscurity in the subsequent history of the Island chapter. Munch conjectures (notes, p. 145) that the right of its members to elect the bishop was disputed by the clergy and the people, to whom it formerly belonged. It is not unlikely that the chapter was occasionally composed of the whole body of the clergy, as was the case in some of the Irish dioceses, and, at one time, in Argyll.

It appears from a bull of Pope Innocent IV., dated the fourteenth of March, 1253 (appendix to the Chronicle of Man, pp. 158, 159), that Richard the Englishman, Bishop of Man, was a canon of St. Andrews in Scotland ; that he was nominated bishop by Serlo, Archbishop of Drontheim, acting

on an order issued by the Pope; and that he was consecrated at Rome by the archbishop.

A series of documents in the archives of the Vatican, printed by Professor Munch (appendix, p. 162-176), throws additional light on the episcopate of William Russel, Bishop of Man. That prelate was confirmed by Pope Clement VI., and was consecrated at Avignon, not, however, by the Pope himself, as formerly mentioned (*supra*, vol. i. p. 354) on the authority of the text of the Chronicle of Man, but by Bertrand, Bishop of Ostia. The date of the consecration must have been, as mentioned by Professor Munch (notes, p. 147), between the twenty-seventh of April and the sixth of May, 1349. My statement (*supra*, vol. i. p. 354), that the consecration of Bishop William at Avignon was probably intended to interrupt the ecclesiastical relations between Man and Norway, is shewn to be erroneous by the documents just referred to. The Pope writes to Arno, Archbishop of Drontheim (appendix to the Chronicle of Man, p. 164), requesting him as metropolitan to bestow his favour and protection on the bishop-elect and the Church of Man. The papal documents shew who were at this time the most powerful lay lords of the Island diocese. Three letters (appendix, p. 164) are specially addressed by the Pope to William de Montacute, Lord of Man, Robert, the Steward of Scotland, Lord of Bute, and John Mac Donald, Lord of Isla.

From a bull of Pope Gregory XI., dated the sixth of November, 1374 (appendix to the Chronicle of Man, p. 184), it appears that John Duncan, Bishop Russel's successor in the see of Man, was formerly Archdeacon of Down. Bishop John was consecrated at Avignon on the twenty-fifth of November, 1374, by Simon de Langham, Cardinal Bishop of Præneste, formerly Archbishop of Canterbury (Munch's edition of the Chronicle of Man, p. 31, and notes, p. 149). At this time the Archbishop of Drontheim was still Metropolitan of Man. Referring to a papal letter to the archbishop (appendix, p. 186), Professor Munch observes (notes, p. 149), "We learn what is exceedingly interesting, that even as far down as 1374, his metropolitan supremacy over the Bishop of

the Sudreys was acknowledged by the curia ; the Sudreyan Church being expressly characterised as ‘ suffraganea tua.’ How long it still continued as such, we are not able to say, from want of documents, yet there is every reason to believe that in the papal chancery nothing was altered in this respect, at least down to the time when the see of St. Andrews was elevated into a metropolitan one by Pope Sixtus IV. in 1472; for in several lists of archiepiscopal sees, with their respective suffragans, dressed [*sic*] in the fifteenth century, and preserved in the Vatican archives, the Episcopus Sodorensis is always referred to as suffragan to the Archiepiscopus Nidrosiensis.”

INDEX.

INDEX.

A.

- Abel, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 331.
- Abercorn, Monastery of, i. 103, 106.
- Aberdeen, Bishopric of, its foundation, i. 266.
- Aberdeen, Breviary of, i. 407.
- Aberdeen, Chapter of, i. 277, 303, 304, 334 ; ii. 310.
- Aberdeen, Church of, legend of its foundation, i. 54, 55.
- Aberdeen, Council of, i. 351.
- Aberdeen, Diocesan Synod of, its meeting in 1661, iii. 181, 182. Its meeting in 1662, 204, 205.
- Aberdeen, Doctors of, their opinion as to the differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed, ii. 371. Their controversy with the Covenanters, iii. 13, 16. Their qualified acceptance of the Negative Confession, 25, 26.
- Aberdeen, Monastery of Trinity Friars at, i. 297.
- Aberdeen, Monasteries of, their destruction at the Reformation, ii. 75.
- Aberdeen, Rural Deaneries of, i. 277.
- Aberdeen, Town of, its opposition to the National Covenant, iii. 12, 13. It receives the thanks of King Charles, 16.
- Aberdeen, University of, its foundation, i. 406. Its visitation in 1690, iii. 320, 321.
- Aberdeen, George, first Earl of, iii. 279.
- Abernethy, Church of, legend of its foundation, i. 31. Account of, 132. It becomes a Culdee monastery, 242.
- Abernethy, John, Bishop of Caithness, ii. 303 ; iii. 43, 87.
- Abraham, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 320.
- Acca, Bishop of Hexham, i. 113.
- Ada, Wife of Prince Henry of Scotland, i. 288.
- Adam, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 304, 317.
- Adam, Bishop of Brechin, i. 348, 353.
- Adam, Bishop of Caithness, i. 304, 317.
- Adamnan, a monk of Coldingham, i. 104.

- Adamnan, St., Abbot of Iona, his Life of St. Columba, i. 45, 46. Is appointed Abbot of Iona, 102. Visits Alfrid, King of Northumbria, 110. Abandons the Scottish usages, 110. Presents his book on the Holy Places to King Alfrid, 110. Persuades the Northern Irish to adopt the Roman usages, 111. Fails in his attempt to establish the Roman usages at Iona, 111. His death, 111. His writings, 112.
- Adamson, John, Provincial of the Black Friars, i. 407.
- Adamson, Patrick, Archbishop of St. Andrews, his birth and education, ii. 198. His appointment to the see of St. Andrews, 198. His alleged sermon against Episcopacy, 198, 199. His embassy to England, 232. His articles against the Presbyterian discipline, 232, 234. Draws up a declaration by the king, 236, 237. Is excommunicated by the Provincial Assembly of Fife, 240. Appeals against the sentence, 240. Makes a modified submission to the General Assembly, 240, 241. His sickness, 257. His recantation, 257, 259. His death, 259. His character, 260, 261.
- Aidan, King of the Scots, his inauguration by St. Columba, i. 58, 59.
- Aidan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, is sent to Northumbria at the request of King Oswald, i. 75, 76. Establishes his see at Lindisfarne, 77. Converts Northumbria, 78, 79. His affection for King Oswin, 80. His death, 81. His character, 81, 82.
- Aikenhead, Thomas, trial of, iii. 337, 338. Charges against the Presbyterian ministers in connection with it, 338.
- Ailred, Abbot of Rievaulx, i. 279.
- Aird, James, Minister at Torryburn, his friendship with Archbishop Leighton, iii. 194. Is one of the archbishop's preachers in the western counties, 237. His deprivation, 301.
- Airth, William, ii. 14.
- Alan, Bishop of Argyll, i. 322, 336.
- Alan I., Bishop of Caithness, i. 335, 348.
- Alan II., Bishop of Caithness, i. 353.
- Alan, Bishop of Man, i. 349.
- Albinus, Bishop of Brechin, i. 320, 335.
- Alchfrid, son of Oswy King of Northumbria, assists in converting Peada, Prince of the Middle Angles, i. 84. Maintains the Roman usages, 88. Attends the Council of Whitby, 89. Procures Wilfrid to be appointed Bishop of York, 99. His death, 101.
- Alcluyd, its capture by the Northumbrians and Picts, i. 123.
- Aldred, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183.
- Aldwin, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183.
- Aless, Alexander, ii. 11.
- Alexander I., King of the Scots,

- i. 205. His correspondence with St. Anselm, 206. His differences with Turgot, Bishop of St. Andrews, 208. His differences with Eadmer, Bishop of St. Andrews, 208, 211-216. His death, 217. His ecclesiastical foundations, 217, 218.
- Alexander II., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 308. His government, 308-311. His death, 311. His ecclesiastical foundations, 314, 315.
- Alexander III., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 326. His coronation, 326. Acquires Man and the Western Islands from Norway, 327. His death and character, 327, 328.
- Alexander, Bishop of Caithness, i. 359, 369.
- Alexander, Bishop of Galloway, i. 370, 381.
- Alexander I., Bishop of Ross, i. 353, 359.
- Alexander II., Bishop of Ross, i. 359, 369.
- Alexander, John, Bishop of Dunkeld, iv. 13, 89.
- Alfrid, King of Northumbria, his education among the Scots, i. 107. His love of learning, 107. Succeeds King Egfrid, 107. His intercourse with St. Adamnan, 110. His death, 113.
- Alison, Archibald, Clergyman at Edinburgh, iv. 124, 132.
- Alison, Isobel, her death, iii. 262.
- Alwin, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 184.
- Anderson, Alexander, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, ii. 34, 55, 101, 102, 164.
- Andrew, St., legend of the relics of, i. 6-9.
- Andrew, Bishop of Argyll, i. 349, 354.
- Andrew, Bishop of Caithness, i. 267, 304.
- Andrew, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 359.
- Andrew, Bishop of Orkney, i. 392, 410.
- Angus I., Bishop of the Isles, i. 370.
- Angus II., Bishop of the Isles, i. 381, 392.
- Annand, John, Principal of St. Leonard's College, ii. 232.
- Annand, William, Minister at Ayr, ii. 389 ; iii. 47, 175.
- Annand, William, Dean of Edinburgh, iii. 211, 214, 304.
- Anne, Queen of Great Britain, her accession, iii. 341. Is favourable to Episcopacy, 345. Receives an address from the clergy of Aberdeen, 366. Her death, 371.
- Antiburgher Synod, formation of the, iv. 75. Changes of opinion among its members, 160. Adopts a new Testimony, 160-163. Its union with the Burgher Synod, 165-169.
- Aodh, King of the Scots, i. 165.
- Applecross, Church of, its foundation by St. Malruba, i. 99. Last notice of it in the Annalists, 133.
- Arbroath, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 292.
- Arbuthnot, Alexander, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, ii. 164, 190.
- Archibald, Bishop of Caithness, i. 335.

- Archibald, Bishop of Murray, i. 334, 347.
- Ardchattan, Monastery of, its foundation, i. 314.
- Argyll, Chapter of, i. 302 ; iii. 201.
- Argyll, Rural Deaneries of, i. 302.
- Argyll, Archibald, Marquis of, joins the Covenanters, iii. 40, 41. Becomes their chief leader among the nobility, 84. His opposition to the Royalists, 132. Is committed to the Tower, 172. His trial, 175, 176. His death, 176.
- Argyll, Archibald, Earl of, iii. 229, 265, 266, 282, 283.
- Arnold, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 287.
- Arnot, David, Bishop of Gallo-way, i. 411 ; ii. 7.
- Arran, James, Earl of, and Duke of Chatel-herault, his regency, ii. 20. Favours the Reformation, 20. Change in his policy, 21. Resigns the regency, 30. Joins the Congregation, 72. Is obliged to retire to France, 143.
- Arran, James Stewart, Earl of, ii. 208, 209, 228, 231, 238, 239.
- Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebais, iii. 400.
- Associate Presbytery, formation of the, iv. 61. Its Testimony, 61, 62. Its Judicial Testimony, 64. Differences among its members, 67, 68. Disagreement with Whitefield, 69, 70. Condemns the Revival at Cambuslang, 71. Takes the name of the Associate Synod, 74. Renews the Covenants, 74.
- Disputes regarding the Burgess Oath, 75. Its disruption, 75, 76.
- Atkins, James, Bishop of Gallo-way, iii. 254, 259, 283, 290, 291.
- Auchterarder Case, account of, iv. 208, 210, 224.
- Auchterarder, Presbytery of, propositions drawn up by, iv. 52, 53.
- Auchterderran, Church of, given to the monastery of Lochleven, i. 188.
- Aumond, Bishop of Man, i. 255.

B.

Bagimont's Roll, i. 330.

Baillie, Robert, Principal of the College of Glasgow, declines, when minister at Kilwinning, to preach before the Diocesan Synod of Glasgow, ii. 389. His account of the tumults about the Liturgy, 393, 394. Is a member of the Glasgow Assembly, iii. 34. His hesitation as to joining in some of the votes, 42. Is appointed Professor of Divinity at Glasgow, 77. Is one of the commissioners at the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 98. His speech at the General Assembly of 1647, 124. Is appointed Principal of the College of Glasgow, 179. Remonstrates with the Earl of Lauderdale, 179. His death, 206.

Baithen, Abbot of Iona, i. 69, 70.

- Balcanquhal, Walter, Minister at Edinburgh, ii. 209, 235, 266-268, 329.
- Balcanquhal, Walter, Dean of Durham, attends the Synod of Dort, ii. 320. Accompanies the Marquis of Hamilton as his ecclesiastical adviser, iii. 17, 18. His speech at the Glasgow Assembly, 39.
- Baldwulf, Bishop of Candida Casa, i. 123, 124.
- Balfour, John, Bishop of Brechin, i. 381, 391.
- Baliol, John, Lord of Barnard Castle, i. 336.
- Balmerino, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 314.
- Balmerino, John, Lord, ii. 404 ; iii. 2, 34, 134, 139.
- Balmyle, Nicholas de, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 348.
- Balrode, Walter de, Bishop of Caithness, i. 335.
- Banchory, St. Ternan's church at, i. 30.
- Bancroft, Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, his sermon at Paul's Cross, ii. 254, 255. His correspondence in Scotland, 255, 256. His letter to Archbishop Adamson, 256. His questions to the Scottish ministers, 288. His opinion regarding ordination by presbyters, 296.
- Barbour, John, Archdeacon of Aberdeen, i. 359.
- Barclay, John, Minister at Cruden, iii. 302.
- Barclay, Robert, of Ury, iii. 268.
- Earon, Robert, Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen, is appointed Professor of Divinity at Marischal College, ii. 372. Writes against the National Covenant, iii. 8. Retires to England, 56. Is nominated to the see of Orkney, 57, 58. His death and character, 64, 65. Examination of his writings by the Aberdeen Assembly, 77.
- Bean, Bishop at Mortlach, i. 193.
- Beaton, Cardinal David, Archbishop of St. Andrews, his birth and education, ii. 16. Is appointed Abbot of Arbroath, 16. Is appointed a Cardinal, 17. Is raised to the primacy and appointed legate a latere, 17. Apprehends Wishart and brings him to trial, 23, 24. Becomes an object of hatred to the people, 27. His death and character, 27, 28.
- Beaton, James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, is appointed to the see of Glasgow, i. 411. Is translated to St. Andrews, ii. 2. His death, 2. His foundation of St. Mary's College, 3.
- Beaton, James, Archbishop of Glasgow, his appointment to the see, ii. 31. Advises Queen Mary to punish the murderers of Darnley, 155. His death, 279. His benefactions to the Scottish College at Paris, 279.
- Beattie, James, Professor of Moral Philosophy at Aberdeen, iv. 145.
- Belachoir, the residence of King Donald, son of Alpin, i. 164.
- Belegambe, Ferquhard de, Bishop of Caithness, i. 348, 353.

- Bellenden, Adam, Bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 303, 358 ; iii. 42, 44.
- Bellenden, John, Archdeacon of Murray, ii. 5.
- Bene, James, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 344, 351.
- Benham, Hugh de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 329, 335.
- Beornelm, a Scottish bishop, i. 231.
- Bernham, David de, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 316, 331.
- Berwick on Tweed, Nunnery at, its foundation, i. 276.
- Biarn, Bishop of Orkney, i. 307.
- Biden, Walter de, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 301.
- Biggar, collegiate church of, its foundation, ii. 19.
- Binning, William, Abbot of Cupar, i. 302.
- Birsa, Church of, its foundation, i. 267.
- Bisset, John, founder of Beaulieu, i. 314.
- Black, David, Minister at St. Andrews, ii. 266.
- Black, John, a Dominican friar, ii. 114, 139.
- Blackader, Robert, Archbishop of Glasgow, i. 387, 391, 411.
- Blackburn, Peter, Bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 278, 303.
- Blair, Robert, Minister at St. Andrews, his birth and education, ii. 340. His dispute with John Cameron, 340. Is appointed minister at Bangor, 341. His ordination, 341. Assists at the communion at Shotts, 341. Is suspended, 342. Is deposed, 342. Sails for New England, 344. His return, 344. Is appointed minister at Ayr, iii. 34. Is a member of the Glasgow Assembly, 34. Is appointed minister at St. Andrews, 63. His treatment of Sir Robert Spottiswood, 115, 116. His interview with Cromwell, 136. Is summoned to London by Cromwell, 162. His death, 206.
- Blaithmac, St., martyrdom of, i. 125, 126.
- Boece, Hector, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, i. 406, 407.
- Boisil, Prior of Melrose, i. 79, 94.
- Bondington, William de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 317, 333.
- Borthwick, Sir John, ii. 20.
- Boston, Thomas, Minister at Ettrick, iv. 52, 54, 85.
- Bothwell, Adam, Bishop of Orkney, ii. 42, 157, 160, 162, 164, 167, 176, 264.
- Boucher, Jonathan, Vicar of Epsom, iv. 112, 113.
- Boyd, Andrew, Bishop of Argyll, ii. 300, 370.
- Boyd, James, Archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 191, 196, 197, 210, 211, 225.
- Boyd, Robert, Principal of the College of Glasgow, ii. 327.
- Brechin, Bishopric of, its foundation, i. 267.
- Brechin, Chapter of, i. 277.
- Brechin, Church of, dedicated by King Kenneth, i. 77.
- Brechin, Culdee monastery at, i. 242.
- Brechin, Round Tower of, i. 177.
- Bresil, Abbot of Iona, i. 125.

- Bricius, Bishop of Murray, i. 303, 308, 317.
- Brown, George, Bishop of Dunkeld, his birth and education, i. 398. Is appointed to the see of Dunkeld, 399. Divides his diocese into rural deaneries, 399. His illness and death, 399-401.
- Brown, John of Priestfield, his death, iii. 281.
- Brown, Robert, ii. 231.
- Bruce, Andrew, Bishop of Orkney, iii. 259, 267, 283, 284, 291, 312.
- Bruce, James, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 378, 379.
- Bruce, Robert, Minister at Edinburgh, assists at the coronation of Anne of Denmark, ii. 247. Denounces the king's indulgence to the Popish lords, 266. His letter to Lord Hamilton, 268, 270. Account of his conversion, 270, 271. His opinion regarding ordination, 271. Seeks refuge in England, 272. Is banished, but afterwards allowed to return to Scotland, 278. His death, 338.
- Brude, son of Mailcon, King of the Picts, i. 52, 53, 57.
- Brude, son of Bili, King of the Picts, i. 105, 115.
- Brude, son of Dereli, King of the Picts, i. 115.
- Buchanan, George, ii. 11, 140, 157, 167, 168.
- Bur, Alexander, Bishop of Murray, i. 353, 358.
- Burgher Synod, formation of the, iv. 75. Changes of opinion among its members, 163-165.
- Its union with the Antiburgher Synod, 165-169.
- Burnet, Alexander, Archbishop of St. Andrews, his appointment to the see of Aberdeen, iii. 212. His translation to Glasgow, 215. Remonstrates against the indulgence to the Presbyterians, 232. Resigns his see, 234. Is restored to the see of Glasgow, 248. Wishes a national synod to be called, 249. Is appointed Archbishop of St. Andrews, 259. Writes to Archbishop Sancroft, 276. His death, 277. His character, 277, 278.
- Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, his birth and education, iii. 223. His ordination, 223. Is presented to the church of Salton, 223. His memorial against the bishops, 224. Is summoned before the bishops, 224. Different accounts of the proceedings, 224, 225. Is appointed Professor of Divinity at Glasgow, 236. Is one of Archbishop Leighton's preachers in the western counties, 237. Attends the archbishop at his conference with the Presbyterian ministers, 239. Resigns his professorship and goes to London, 248. Declines to use his influence on behalf of the Scottish clergy, 296. Opposes the Toleration Bill, 363.
- Burnet, Robert of Crimond, his early life, iii. 109, 110. Refuses to sign the National Covenant, 110. Refuses to sign the Solemn League and Covenant,

110. Goes abroad, 110. His correspondence with Johnstone of Warriston, 110, 111. Returns from exile, 166. His residence at Aberdeen, 166.

C.

Cadroe, St., account of, i. 179-181.

Cairncross, Alexander, Archbishop of Glasgow, his appointment to the see of Brechin, iii. 277. His translation to Glasgow, 278. His deprivation, 285. Is appointed Bishop of Raphoe, 313. His death, 313.

Cairncross, Robert, Bishop of Ross, ii. 18.

Caithness, Bishopric of, its foundation, i. 267.

Caithness, Chapter of, i. 277, 319.

Calculith, Council of, i. 127, 128.

Calderwood, David, Minister at Crailing, is deprived, ii. 308. Writes against the Perth Articles, 324. Retires to Holland, 329. Publishes his *Altare Damascenum*, 329. Returns to Scotland, iii. 34. His death, 150.

Cambuskenneth, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 273.

Cambuslang, Revival at, iv. 70, 71.

Cameron, John, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 368, 378.

Cameron, John, Principal of the College of Glasgow, ii. 327, 328.

Cameron, Richard, iii. 261, 262.

Campbell, Alexander, Bishop of Brechin, ii. 151, 195, 290.

Campbell, Archibald, one of the College Bishops, joins in the insurrection of the Earl of Argyll, iii. 356. His exile, 356. His return to Britain and change of opinions, 356. His consecration, 356. Is elected Bishop of Aberdeen, 386. Continues to reside at London, 386. Takes part in the correspondence with the Eastern bishops, 400-404. His death, iv. 31. His gift of Scottish ecclesiastical records to Sion College, 31, 32.

Campbell, Donald, Bishop of Brechin, ii. 39, 40, 145.

Campbell, George, Principal of Marischal College, iv. 145.

Campbell, John, Bishop of Argyll, ii. 290, 300.

Campbell, John, I., Bishop of the Isles, ii. 40.

Campbell, John, II., Bishop of the Isles, ii. 182.

Campbell, John Macleod, Minister at Row, iv. 199, 200.

Campbell, Neil, Bishop of Argyll, ii. 238.

Campbell, Neil, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 338 ; iii. 42, 88.

Canaries, James, Minister at Selkirk, iii. 285, 329.

Candida Casa, Church of, its foundation by St. Ninian, i. 13, 14. Its fame in early times, 20, 21. Its restoration as a Northumbrian see, 120, 121. Its third erection in the reign of King David, 268, 269.

Candida Casa, Præmonstratensian monastery at, its foundation, i. 269.

- Candlish, Robert S., Minister at Edinburgh, iv. 221.
- Canons of 1636, ii. 362-368.
- Canons of 1727, iv. 1, 2.
- Canons of 1809, iv. 126, 127.
- Canons of 1811, iv. 129-135.
- Canons of 1828, iv. 182-185.
- Canons of 1829, iv. 186, 187.
- Canons of 1838, iv. 192-195.
- Cant, Andrew, Minister at Aberdeen, iii. 13, 77, 143, 164, 182, 206.
- Cant, Andrew, Principal of the College of Edinburgh, iii. 250, 252.
- Cant, Andrew, one of the College Bishops, iii. 285, 300, 387, 394, 398, 399 ; iv. 6.
- Cardney, Robert de, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 358, 368.
- Cargill, Donald, iii. 261, 262.
- Carlisle, Council of, i. 261.
- Carlyle, Alexander, Minister at Inveresk, iv. 82, 155, 156.
- Carmelite Friars, brought to Scotland, i. 331.
- Carmichael, George, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 387.
- Carrick, Duncan, Earl of, i. 314.
- Carsewell, John, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 83, 156, 181, 182.
- Carstairs, William, Principal of the College of Edinburgh, his alleged remonstrance with King William, iii. 332-334. Petitions against the Toleration and Patronage Bills, 364, 365. His death, 367. His character, 367.
- Catechism of 1552, ii. 36, 37.
- Cedd, Bishop of the East Saxons, i. 89, 94, 99.
- Cellach, Abbot of Iona, i. 299 ; iv. 284.
- Ceolfred, Abbot of Jarrow, i. 110, 111, 116, 117.
- Chad, Bishop of Lichfield, i. 100, 101.
- Chalmers, Thomas, Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, his birth and education, iv. 201. Is appointed minister at Kilmany, 201. Is appointed minister at Glasgow, 202. Is appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrews, 202. Is appointed Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, 202. His pamphlet in the Leslie Controversy, 202, 203. His motion regarding Patronage in the General Assembly of 1832, 205. His exertions in the cause of the Established Church, 210. Is chairman of the Convocation, 224. His labours previous to the Disruption, 226. Leaves the Established Church, 232. Is chosen Moderator of the first General Assembly of the Free Church, 234. His death, 234. His character, 235.
- Chalons on the Saone, Council of, i. 128.
- Charles I., King of Great Britain, his birth and baptism, ii. 278. His accession, 335. His instructions regarding ecclesiastical affairs, 336. Restores some of the alienated church lands, 336. Makes an arrangement in regard to the tithes, 337. Visits Scotland, 344.

- His coronation, 344, 345.
 His return to England, 346.
 Erects the see of Edinburgh, 347, 348. Writes to the Privy Council about the tumult at Edinburgh, 387. Sends the Marquis of Hamilton as Commissioner to Scotland, iii. 7. Leads an army against the Covenanters, 58. Enters into an accommodation, 59, 60. Renews the war, but again enters into negotiations, 81, 82. His second visit to Scotland, 85, 86. His concessions to the Covenanters, 86. Seeks refuge with the Scottish army, 116. Refuses to subscribe the Covenant, 117. His controversial correspondence with Henderson, 117-121. Is surrendered by the Scots, 123. His negotiations in the Isle of Wight, 130, 131. His death, 137.
- Charles II., King of Great Britain, is proclaimed King at Edinburgh, iii. 138. Signs the Covenant, 146. Is crowned at Scone, 151-153. His defeat at Worcester, 156. His restoration, 167. Writes to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, 173, 174. Grants an indulgence to the Presbyterians, 231. His death, 279.
- Charles, grandson of James II., lands in Scotland, iv. 31. Results of his enterprise, 32-35. His death, 101.
- Charteris, Lawrence, Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, is one of Archbishop Leighton's preachers in the western counties, iii. 237. His character, 237, 238. Declines to take the Test, and resigns his charge, 267. Is minister at Dirleton, 325. His address on the fast ordered by the General Assembly, 325-327. His death, 327.
- Cheyam, John de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 333.
- Cheyne, Henry de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 335, 347.
- Chisholm, James, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 391, 410; ii. 6.
- Chisholm, William, I., Bishop of Dunblane, ii. 6, 86, 103.
- Chisholm, William, II., Bishop of Dunblane, ii. 103, 141, 264.
- Christian, Bishop of Galloway, i. 306.
- Christian, Bishop of Man, i. 270, 306.
- Christie, Henry, one of the College Bishops, iii. 355, 356.
- Christison, William, Minister at Dundee, ii. 80.
- Churches, their consecration among the disciples of Columba, i. 150, 151. Their dedication among the Culdees, 239.
- Clement, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 320-322, 335.
- Cockburn, John, nephew of Bishop Scougal, account of, iii. 270, 271.
- Cockburn, Robert, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 410; ii. 4.
- Coldingham, Monastery of, i. 104, 169, 205.
- Coldstream, Nunnery of, its foundation, i. 288.

- Colman, Bishop of Lindisfarne, succeeds Finan, i. 87. Attends the Council of Whitby, 89. Defends the Scottish usages, 90-93. Resigns his see and returns to Iona, 93, 94. Goes to Ireland and erects the monastery of Innisboffin, 97. His death, 99.
- Colquhoun, Robert, Bishop of Argyll, i. 381, 391.
- Columba, St., authorities for his life, i. 45, 46. His birth, 46, 47. His education, 47. Is ordained a deacon, 47. Founds monasteries at Derry and Durrow, 48. Is ordained a priest, 48. Leaves Ireland and arrives in Britain, 49. Founds the monastery of Iona, 50, 51. Instructs the Scots of Argyll, 51. Converts the Northern Picts, 52-56. Miracles ascribed to him, 52-54. Founds various monasteries, 56, 57. Inaugurates Aidan, King of the Scots, 58, 59. Attends the Council of Drumceat, 60, 61. Visits his Irish monasteries, 61. His interview with St. Comgall, 61, 62. Returns to Iona, 62. His acts of piety and charity, 62-64. His last hours, 65, 66. His death, 67, 68.
- Colville, William, Principal of the College of Edinburgh, iii. 134, 143, 211, 212.
- Common Order, Book of, ii. 97, 98.
- Common Prayer, English Book of, its introduction into Scotland, iii. 358-360, 368, 369.
- Common Prayer, Scottish Book of, its compilation, ii. 377-381. Its contents, 381-384. Tumult when it was first read at Edinburgh, 384-387. Objections made to it, 395, 396.
- Communion Office, Scottish, account of, iv. 24-29. Differences between it and the Communion Office in the Scottish Prayer Book, 87, 88.
- Conain, Abbot of Iona, i. 113, 114.
- Conal, King of the Scots, bestows Iona on St. Columba, i. 50. His death, 58.
- Confession of Faith of 1560, is presented to the parliament and ratified, ii. 84-86. Account of it, 89-91. Its compilers, 91.
- Confession of the Reformed in Switzerland, approved of by the Scottish Reformers, ii. 151, 152.
- Confession of Faith of 1581, ii. 213-216.
- Confession of Faith of 1616, ii. 306.
- Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, iii. 125-130.
- Congregationalism, its rise in Scotland, iv. 167-170. Formation of the Congregational Union, 170, 171.
- Connmach, Abbot of Iona, i. 125.
- Connochar, John, trial of, iv. 42, 43.
- Constantine, son of Kenneth, King of the Scots, i. 165.
- Constantine, son of Aodh, King of the Scots, his accession, i. 166.

- Transfers the Primacy from Dunkeld to St. Andrews, 166-168. Attends the Council of Scone, 172. Is defeated at Brunanburgh, 173, 174. Becomes a monk at St. Andrews, 174. His death, 174.
- Constantine, son of Culen, King of the Scots, i. 181.
- Constitutional Associate Presbytery, formation of the, iv. 163.
- Cook, George, Professor of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrews, iv. 153, 206, 208, 211, 220, 233.
- Cook, Patrick, one of Archbishop Leighton's preachers, iii. 237.
- Corbet, John, Minister at Bonhill, iii. 57, 89.
- Cormac, St., the Navigator, i. 55, 56.
- Cormac, Bishop at Mortlach, i. 193.
- Cormac, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 218, 265 ; iv. 283.
- Cospatrick, Earl, i. 288.
- Council of Whitby, i. 89-93. Of Calcluith, 127, 128. Of Chalons on the Saone, 128. Of Scone, 167, 168, 172, 173. Of Roxburgh, 261. Of Carlisle, 261. Of Northampton, 290, 291. Of Edinburgh, 291. Of Perth, 297, 308, 313. Of Edinburgh, 313. Of Perth, 329, 330. Of Dundee, 343. Of Perth, 343. Of Scone, 343. Of Aberdeen, 351. Of Edinburgh, 351. Of Perth, 364, 365, 374. Of Edinburgh, 396. Of Edinburgh, ii. 2. Of Edinburgh, 33. Of Linlithgow, 33-35. Of Edinburgh, 36-38. Of Linlithgow, 38. Of Edinburgh, 52. Of Edinburgh, 53, 55-59.
- Councils and Conservators, establishment of the system of, i. 309, 310.
- Covenant, National, iii. 2, 3.
- Covenant, Solemn League and, iii. 96, 97.
- Cowper, William, Bishop of Galloway, conforms to Episcopacy, ii. 300. Is appointed to the see of Galloway, 300. His death, 320. His opinions regarding the Episcopal office, 321.
- Craig, Edward, Clergyman at Edinburgh, iv. 180, 181.
- Craig, John, Minister at Edinburgh, narrative of his conversion from Popery, ii. 113, 114. Its exaggerated statements, 114. Is appointed a commissioner to arrange the ecclesiastical polity, 176. Prepares the King's Confession, 213. Submits to the King, 236.
- Crawar, Paul, preaches the Hussite opinions in Scotland, i. 366. His death, 367.
- Crennach, John, Bishop of Brechin, i. 369, 381.
- Crichton, George, Bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 4, 17.
- Crichton, Robert, Bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 30, 86, 250.
- Crinan, Abbot of Dunkeld, i. 184, 185.
- Cromwell, Oliver, defeats the Duke of Hamilton, iii. 135. Is invited by the Covenanters to Edinburgh, 136. His in-

- interview with the Presbyterian ministers, 136. Defeats the Scots at Dunbar, 148. Defeats the King at Worcester, 156. Summons several of the Presbyterian ministers to London, 162. Passes an ordinance for the ecclesiastical government of Scotland, 162.
 Crossraguel, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 314.
 Culdees, account of the, i. 227-231.
 Culen, son of Indulf, King of the Scots, i. 176.
 Culross, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 313.
 Cuminius, Abbot of Iona, his Life of Columba, i. 45. Is appointed Abbot of Iona, 86. His death, 98.
 Cummian, an Irish monk, his letter on the Paschal Festival, i. 72, 73.
 Cumyn, William, Earl of Bûchan, i. 313.
 Cumyn, William, Prior of the Culdees of St. Andrews, i. 343-345.
 Cunningham, David, Bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 200, 264, 278.
 Cunningham, Sir John, iii. 229.
 Cunningham, William, Minister at Edinburgh, iv. 217, 219.
 Cupar, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 288.
 Cuthbert, St., Bishop of Lindisfarne, becomes a monk at Melrose, i. 79. Removes to Ripon, 90. Returns to Melrose, 90. Succeeds Boisil as Prior of Melrose, 94. Is appointed Prior of Lindisfarne, 95. Is appointed Bishop of Lindisfarne, 104. His consecration, 104. Dissuades King Egfrid from attacking the Picts, 105. Retires to the isle of Farne, 108. His death, 108.
 Cutheard, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 170.
 Cynewulf, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 120, 124.
- D.
- Dalmulin, Monastery of, its foundation, i. 314.
 Daltoun, Thomas de, Bishop of Galloway, i. 349.
 Danielston, Walter of, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 357.
 David I., King of the Scots, his government of Cumbria, i. 219. Restores the Church of Glasgow, 219-222. His accession to the Scottish throne, 256. His good government, 257-260. Reforms the Scottish Church, 260, 261. His ecclesiastical foundations, 266-276. His domestic life, 278-282. His administration of the laws, 282. His sickness and death, 283-285.
 David II., King of the Scots, i. 350.
 David, Earl of Huntingdon, i. 289, 297.
 David, Bishop of Caithness, i. 353.
 Davidson, John, Principal of the College of Glasgow, ii. 63.
 Deer, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 313, 314.
 Deer, Book of, iv. 283.

- Deer, St. Drostan's church at, i. 314.
- Devorgoil, wife of John Baliol, i. 330, 331.
- Deyn, William de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 353.
- Dickson, David, Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, his appointment as minister at Irvine, ii. 339. His opposition to the Perth Articles, 339. Effects of his teaching, 339. Assists in preparing a complaint against the bishops, 404. Disputes with the Doctors of Aberdeen, iii. 13-16. Is a member of the Glasgow Assembly, 34. Is Moderator of the General Assembly of 1639, 61. His interview with Cromwell, 136. Is Moderator of the General Assembly of 1653, 158. Protests against its dissolution, 158. His death, 206.
- Diermit, Abbot of Iona, i. 125-127.
- Directory for Public Worship, of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, iii. 101-103.
- Discipline, First Book of, ii. 91-97.
- Discipline, Second Book of, ii. 217-225.
- Diuma, Bishop of the Mercians, i. 84, 85.
- Dolffin, Bishop of Orkney, i. 337, 349.
- Dominican Friars, their introduction into Scotland, i. 315, 316.
- Donald, son of Alpin, King of the Scots, i. 164.
- Donald, son of Constantine, King of the Scots, i. 166.
- Donald Bane, King of the Scots, i. 204.
- Donald, Abbot of Brechin, i. 242.
- Donertius, Bishop at Mortlach, i. 193.
- Donydouer, Stephen de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 345.
- Dorben, Abbot of Iona, i. 114.
- Dornoch, Monastery at, i. 267.
- Dort, Synod of, ii. 320.
- Dougal, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 359.
- Douglas, Alexander, Bishop of Murray, ii. 278, 330.
- Douglas, Gavin, Bishop of Dunkeld, attempts to obtain the see of St. Andrews, i. 397, 398. Is appointed Bishop of Dunkeld, 401. Is obliged to retire to England, 401. His death and character, 402.
- Douglas, George, Bishop of Murray, ii. 191.
- Douglas, John, Archbishop of St. Andrews, ii. 91, 171, 180, 190, 191, 197.
- Douglas, John, a Protestant preacher, ii. 48, 50, 51, 84.
- Douglas, Robert, Minister at Edinburgh, is Moderator of the General Assembly of 1642, iii. 93. Is Moderator of the General Assembly of 1649, 142. Preaches at the coronation of Charles II. at Scone, 152, 153. Is seized by the English, 157. Is released, 158. Is summoned to London by Cromwell, 162. His correspondence with Sharp, 169-172. Declines to accept the bishopric of Edinburgh, 196, 197. Takes the benefit

- of the indulgence, 231. His death, 248.
- Douglas, Robert, Bishop of Dunblane, iii. 276, 312, 351, 352, 355.
- Drummond, James, Bishop of Brechin, iii. 278, 284, 312.
- Drummond, William Abernethy, Bishop of Edinburgh, iv. 99, 101, 103, 112, 124, 142.
- Dryburgh, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 274.
- Drythelm, a monk of Melrose, i. 109.
- Dubdalethe, Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Dubtach, Abbot of Iona, i. 186.
- Duff, son of Malcolm, King of the Scots, i. 184.
- Duibduin, Abbot of Iona, i. 186.
- Duibscuile, Abbot of Iona, i. 186.
- Dumfries, Synod of, its meeting in 1661, iii. 180.
- Dunbar, Collegiate Church of, its foundation, i. 351.
- Dunbar, Patrick, Earl of, i. 315.
- Dunbar, Columba de, Bishop of Murray, i. 368.
- Dunbar, Gavin, Bishop of Aberdeen, his appointment to the see, i. 410. Completes the foundations of Bishop Elphinstone, ii. 5. His munificence, 5. His death, 5.
- Dunbar, Gavin, Archbishop of Glasgow, his appointment to the see, ii. 7. Maintains the independence of Glasgow, 18. His reception of Contarini, Patriarch of Venice, 1. His death, 19.
- Dunbar, William, Bishop of Aberdeen, iii. 399 ; iv. 5, 9, 46.
- Dunblane, burnt by the Britons, i. 162.
- Dunblane, Bishopric of, its foundation, i. 268.
- Dunblane, Chapter of, i. 277, 322.
- Dunblane, Diocesan Synod of, its meeting in 1662, iii. 202-204.
- Duncan I., King of the Scots, i. 184.
- Duncan II., King of the Scots, i. 204, 205.
- Duncan, Alexander, Bishop of Glasgow, iii. 395, 396, 398, 399 ; iv. 7, 8.
- Duncan, John, Bishop of Man, i. 360 ; iv. 286.
- Dunchad I., Abbot of Iona, i. 113, 114, 118.
- Dunchad II., Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Dunchad III., Abbot of Iona, i. 193.
- Dunchad, Abbot of Dunkeld, i. 176.
- Dundee, Council of, i. 343.
- Dundee, John, Viscount of, iii. 260, 299, 304, 310.
- Dundee, Thomas de, Bishop of Ross, i. 347.
- Dundrennan, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 276.
- Dunfermline, Monastery of, its foundation, i. 190. Becomes a Benedictine house, 274.
- Dunkeld, Bishopric of, its foundation, i. 218.
- Dunkeld, Chapter of, i. 277, 317.
- Dunkeld, Church of, becomes the seat of the Primacy, i. 129-31. Ceases to be the seat of the Primacy, 166-168.

Dunkeld, Culdee monastery at, i. 241, 242.

Dunkeld, Rural Deaneries of, i. 278.

Durie, Andrew, Bishop of Galloway, ii. 19, 40.

Durie, John, Minister at Edinburgh, ii. 183, 193, 227, 229.

Durie, John, his attempt to reconcile the Lutherans and the Reformed, ii. 371. Applies to Archbishop Spottiswood, 371. Writes to the divines of Aberdeen, and obtains their opinion, 371.

Duthac, St., i. 318.

E

Eadbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 109, 113.

Eadfrid, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 113, 114.

Eadmer, Bishop of St. Andrews, a disciple of St. Anselm, i. 210. Is appointed to the see of St. Andrews, 210. His disputes with King Alexander, 211-213. Leaves Scotland, 213. Offers to return, 215. His death, 216. His writings, 216.

Eanbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 124.

Eardulf, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 169.

Easter, disputes regarding the time for celebrating, i. 71-73, 87-93, 115-117.

Eastern Church, correspondence between its bishops, and the Nonjuring bishops, iii. 400-404.

Eata, Bishop of Lindisfarne, is educated by Aidan, i. 78. Becomes Abbot of Melrose, 79. Removes to Ripon, 90. Returns to Melrose, 90, 94. Is appointed Abbot of Lindisfarne, 94. Is appointed Bishop of Lindisfarne, 102, 103. Resigns Lindisfarne and becomes Bishop of Hexham, 104. His death, 107.

Ebba, Abbess of Coldingham, i. 102, 103, 104.

Eccles, Nunnery of, its foundation, i. 288.

Eccred, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 124.

Eden, Robert, Bishop of Murray, iv. 270.

Edgar, King of the Scots, i. 201, 204, 205.

Edgar, Henry, Bishop of Fife, iv. 48, 87.

Edinburgh, acquired by the Scots, i. 175.

Edinburgh, Bishopric of, its foundation, ii. 347, 348.

Edinburgh, Councils of, i. 291, 313, 351, 396; ii. 2, 33, 36-38, 52, 53, 55-59.

Edinburgh, Clergy of, disputes between them and the Bishops, iv. 20-24, 29-31.

Edinburgh, Diocesan Synod of, its meeting in 1662, iii. 202.

Edinburgh, University of, its visitation in 1690, iii. 319, 320.

Edward, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 260, 303, 304.

Egbert, an English priest, i. 105, 118-120.

Egbert, Archbishop of York, i. 121, 122.

- Egbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 124.
- Egfrid, King of Northumbria, his accession, i. 101. His quarrel with Wilfrid, 102. Induces St. Cuthbert to accept the see of Lindisfarne, 104. Invades the Pictish territory, 105. His defeat and death, 105.
- Elena, Monastery in, i. 57.
- Elfsig, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183.
- Elgin, burning of its cathedral, i. 358.
- Elphinstone, William, Bishop of Aberdeen, his birth, i. 403. His education, 404. His ordination, 404. His residence in France, 404. Returns to Scotland, and is appointed Official of Glasgow, 404. Is appointed Official of Lothian, 405. His foreign embassies, 405. Is nominated to the see of Ross, 405. His translation to Aberdeen, 405. Founds the University of Aberdeen, 406. Causes the Breviary of Aberdeen to be printed, 407. His private life, 407, 408. Declines to accept the Primacy, 408. His illness and death, 409.
- Eocha, King of the Scots, i. 165, 166.
- Erland, Earl of Orkney, i. 247.
- Ermengarde, wife of King William the Lion, i. 297, 314.
- Erskine, Ebenezer, Minister at Stirling, remonstrates against the condemnation of the Marrow of Modern Divinity, iv. 54. Protests against the Act of Assembly of 1732, regarding Patronage, 57. His sermon before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, 58. Is rebuked by the General Assembly, 58. His Protest, 58. Is suspended, 59. Is deprived, 60. His Protest, 60, 61. Declines proposals of reconciliation, 62, 63. Is deposed, 65, 66. Is deposed and excommunicated by the Antiburgher Synod, 76. His death, 76.
- Erskine, John, Superintendent of Angus, is one of the Protestant leaders, ii. 44. Invites Knox to his house of Dun, 45. Signs a bond in defence of the Protestant opinions, 49. Endeavours to effect an accommodation between Mary of Lorraine and the Protestants, 67. Is appointed Superintendent of Angus, 55. Pronounces sentence of deprivation on the Principal and Regents of King's College, 164. His letters to the Regent Mar, 171-174. Is appointed a commissioner to arrange the ecclesiastical polity, 176. Maintains the episcopal government, 238. His death, 247. His opinions regarding the episcopal office, 248.
- Erskine, John, of Carnock, iv. 85.
- Erskine, John, Minister at Edinburgh, iv. 138, 144.
- Erskine, Ralph, Minister at Dunfermline, iv. 54, 68, 76.
- Ete, daughter of Gillemichel, iv. 283.
- Ethelbert, Bishop of Candida Casa, iv. 123.

- Ethelred, Abbot of Dunkeld, i. 204, 205.
- Ethelwald, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 109, 120.
- Ethelwulf, Bishop of Carlisle, i. 265.
- Ethica, Monasteries in, i. 57.
- Eucharist, the, manner in which it was celebrated by Columba and his disciples, i. 145, 146. Manner in which it was celebrated by the Culdees, 240.
- Ewing, Alexander, Bishop of Argyll, iv. 270.
- F.
- Fail, Monastery of Trinity Friars at, i. 331.
- Failbe I., Abbot of Iona, i. 98, 102.
- Failbe II., Abbot of Iona, i. 122.
- Failbe, Abbot of Applecross, i. 120.
- Failchu, Abbot of Iona, i. 114, 119.
- Fairfoul, Andrew, Archbishop of Glasgow, iii. 192, 195, 215.
- Fairley, James, Bishop of Argyll, ii. 370, 385; iii. 42, 88.
- Falconer, Colin, Bishop of Murray, iii. 259, 284.
- Falconer, John, one of the College Bishops, his consecration, iii. 355, 356. Superintends the district of Fife, 385. His letter regarding the usages, 389. His letter to Bishop Keith, 392, 393. His death and character, 393, 394.
- Falconer, William, Bishop of Edinburgh, iv. 12, 87, 90, 91.
- Fall, James, Principal of the College of Glasgow, iii. 298, 318, 319.
- Feidlimid, Abbot of Iona, i. 114.
- Felix, Bishop of Murray, i. 303.
- Feradach, Abbot of Iona, i. 168.
- Fergus, Lord of Galloway, i. 268, 269, 273, 276, 286.
- Ferguson, David, Minister at Dunfermline, ii. 80, 175, 275.
- Ferne, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 314.
- Ferquhard, Earl of Ross, i. 314.
- Fife, Synod of, its meeting in 1661, iii. 179.
- Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, succeeds Aidan, i. 83. Baptizes Peada, Prince of the Middle Angles, 84. Baptizes Sigebert, King of the East Saxons, 85. Consecrates Cedd Bishop of the East Saxons, 86. His death, 87.
- Fingask, Thomas de, Bishop of Caithness, i. 353.
- Finlay, Bishop of Argyll, i. 360, 369, 370.
- Finlay, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 359, 369.
- Fisher, Edward, author of the Marrow of Modern Divinity, iv. 54.
- Fisher, James, Minister at Kincleven, iv. 58.
- Flaithbertach, Abbot of Dunkeld, i. 165.
- Flann, Abbot of Iona, i. 168.
- Flanobra, Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Fleming, Malcolm, Lord, ii. 19.
- Fleming, Malcolm, Prior of Whit-horn, ii. 132, 144.
- Fletcher, David, Bishop of Argyll, iii. 87, 197, 226.
- Florence, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 301.

Fogo, John, Abbot of Melrose, i. 364.

Forbes, Alexander, Bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 283, 303, 311.

Forbes, Alexander Penrose, Bishop of Brechin, iv. 251, 272-274.

Forbes, Duncan, President of the Court of Session, iv. 85, 113.

Forbes, John, Minister at Alford, is elected Moderator by the ministers who met at Aberdeen, ii. 284. Is committed to prison, 284. Is banished, 289. His death, 338.

Forbes, John, Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen, his birth and education, ii. 372. His residence on the Continent, 372. His ordination, 373. Is appointed Professor of Divinity at King's College, 373. Publication of his *Irenicum*, 373. Writes against the National Covenant, iii. 8. Retires to his Castle of Corse, 56. Charges against him at the Aberdeen Assembly, 74, 75. Is ordered to appear at Edinburgh, 75. Declines to obey, 79. Is deposed, 80. His submissive conduct, 107, 108. Goes abroad rather than subscribe the Solemn League and Covenant, 108. Returns to Scotland, 108. His death, 109. His character, 109.

Forbes, John, Parson of Auchterless, iii. 72.

Forbes, Patrick, Bishop of Aberdeen, his birth and education, ii. 311. His intimacy with Andrew Melville, 311. His change of opinion regarding

Episcopacy, 311. Becomes minister at Keith, 312. Is appointed to the see of Aberdeen, 312. His letter to Archbishop Spottiswood, 312, 314. His consecration, 314. His episcopal government, 353, 354. His illness, 354-356. His death, 357. His character, 357, 358.

Forbes, Patrick, Bishop of Caithness, iii. 197, 259.

Forbes, Robert, Bishop of Ross, iv. 87, 89.

Forbes, William, Bishop of Edinburgh, his birth and education, ii. 330. His residence on the Continent, 330. Is appointed one of the ministers of Aberdeen, 330. His theological opinions, 331. Is appointed Principal of Marischal College, 331. Is appointed one of the ministers of Edinburgh, 331. Censures the members of the Kirk-Session, 332. Resumes his former pastoral charge at Aberdeen, 333. Preaches before King Charles, 348, 349. Is appointed Bishop of Edinburgh, 349. His consecration, 349. His illness and death, 349. His character, 350. His writings, 351, 352.

Forbes, Sir William, of Pitsligo, iv. 115.

Fordun, St. Palladius' church at, i. 25.

Foreman, Andrew, Archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 397, 398, 402.

Forester, Walter, Bishop of Brechin, i. 359, 369.

- Form of Church Government and Ordination of Ministers, of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, iii. 104, 105.
- Forrest, Henry, a Benedictine monk, his death, ii. 10.
- Forret, Thomas, a canon-regular, his death, ii. 10.
- Forteviot, the residence of the Pictish Kings, i. 129, 132.
- Fothad I., Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 173, 175, 176.
- Fothad II., Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 188, 190, 197, 203.
- Franciscan Friars, their introduction into Scotland, i. 315, 316.
- Fraser, John, Bishop of Ross, i. 391, 410.
- Fraser, William, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 333, 343.
- Free Church of Scotland, its formation, iv. 234.
- Freebairn, David, Bishop of Edinburgh, iii. 387, 394 ; iv. 5, 8-10.
- Frithwald, Bishop of Candida Casa, i. 121, 123.
- Fullarton, John, Bishop of Edinburgh, his consecration, iii. 348, 350. Is appointed Bishop of Edinburgh and Primus, 384. His death, 399.
- Funeral rites, manner of their observance by Columba and his disciples, i. 149, 150.
- Fyvie, Thomas de, Bishop of Ross, i. 335.
- G.
- Gadderar, James, Bishop of Aberdeen, his consecration, iii. 357, 358. Is appointed Bishop of Aberdeen, 386, 387. His reception in his diocese, 390. Articles of agreement between him and the College Bishops, 394, 395. Is chosen bishop by the clergy of Murray, 395. His death, iv. 8.
- Galloway, Chapter of, i. 277, 333.
- Galloway, Diocese of, i. 268, 269.
- Galloway, Rural Deaneries of, i. 277, 278.
- Galloway, Synod of, its meeting in 1661, iii. 180.
- Galloway, Alexander, Parson of Kinkell, i. 407 ; ii. 9.
- Gamaliel, Bishop of Man, i. 255, 270.
- Gameline, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 331, 332.
- Garden, George, Minister at Aberdeen, his funeral sermon on Henry Scougal, iii. 270. Publishes his Apology for Madame Bourignon, 339. Is deposed by the General Assembly, 339. Continues to officiate as before, 339. Writes in favour of Toleration, 346. Presents an Address to Queen Anne, 366, 367. Presents an Address to the Chevalier, 374. Is imprisoned, 375. His death, iv. 8.
- Garden, James, Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen, iii. 321, 339, 366, 374, 375.
- Gardiner, Colonel, iv. 85.
- Gartnait MacCannech, iv. 283.
- General Assembly, of 1560, ii. 100, 101. Of 1561, 102, 111. Of 1562, 112, 113, 132. Of

- 1563, 136, 138, 139. Of 1564, 139, 140. Of 1565, 144. Of 1566, 154. Of 1567, 157, 158, 162. Of 1568, 163, 164. Of 1572, 180, 181. Of 1573, 190, 191. Of 1574, 192, 193. Of 1575, 193, 194. Of 1576, 196, 197. Of 1577, 197, 200. Of 1578, 210, 212. Of 1580, 212. Of 1581, 216, 217. Of 1582, 227, 229, 230. Of 1583, 230. Of 1584, 231, 232. Of 1586, 240, 241. Of 1587, 250, 251. Of 1590, 251, 252. Of 1592, 260, 261. Of 1597, 274, 275. Of 1598, 275. Of 1600, 276, 277. Of 1605, 284. Of 1606, 290. Of 1608, 290, 291. Of 1610, 292-295. Of 1616, 305, 306. Of 1617, 310. Of 1618, 314-319. Of 1638, iii. 35-49. Of 1639, 61-63. Of 1640, 70-77. Of 1641, 84, 85. Of 1642, 93, 94. Of 1643, 95, 96. Of 1644, 98. Of 1645, 101. Of 1647, 124, 125. Of 1648, 132-135. Of 1649, 142, 143. Of 1650, 146, 147. Of 1651, 155, 156. Of 1652, 157, 158. Of 1653, 158, 159. Of 1690, 323-325. Of 1692, 328-330. Of 1694, 332. Of 1695, 337. Of 1697, 338, 339. Of 1701, 339. Of 1707, 360, 361. Of 1717, iv. 53. Of 1720, 53. Of 1722, 54. Of 1730, 56. Of 1731, 57. Of 1732, 57. Of 1733, 58, 59. Of 1734, 62. Of 1739, 64. Of 1740, 65. Of 1749, 77. Of 1750, 77. Of 1751, 77. Of 1752, 78, 79. Of 1755, 81. Of 1757, 82. Of 1766, 140, 141. Of 1779, 142, 143. Of 1799, 148-150. Of 1805, 153-155. Of 1816, 156, 157. Of 1820, 157-159. Of 1831, 197, 198, 200. Of 1832, 205. Of 1833, 205, 206. Of 1834, 207, 208. Of 1839, 211, 212. Of 1840, 215. Of 1841, 217-220. Of 1842, 221-224. Of 1843, 227-233.
- Geoffrey, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 316, 317.
- George I., King of Great Britain, his accession, iii. 372. Orders the Nonjuring meeting-houses to be shut up, 374. Receives an address from the Commissioners of the General Assembly, 377, 378. His death, 400.
- George II., King of Great Britain, his accession, iv. 1. His death, 48.
- George III., King of Great Britain, his accession, iv. 86. His aversion to persecution, 86, 87. His title acknowledged by the Scottish bishops, 102. His death, 136.
- George IV., King of Great Britain, his visit to Scotland, iv. 172. Receives an address from the Scottish bishops, 172, 173.
- Gerard, Alexander, Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen, iv. 145.
- Gerard, Andrew, Bishop of Aberdeen, iv. 46, 47, 88.
- Gib, John, iii. 263.
- Gilbert, St., Bishop of Caithness, i. 319.
- Gilbert, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 317.

- Gilbert, Bishop of Galloway, i. 323, 336.
- Gilchrist, Abbot of Iona, i. 193.
- Gilla Alden, Bishop of Galloway, i. 269, 306.
- Gillan, John, Bishop of Dunblane, iii. 398, 399.
- Gillespie, George, Minister at Edinburgh, ii. 395 ; iii. 98, 124, 135.
- Gillespie, Patrick, Principal of the College of Glasgow, iii. 149, 156, 162, 163, 177.
- Gillespie, Thomas, Minister at Carnock, iv. 78, 79.
- Gladstone, William Ewart, iv. 245, 275, 276.
- Gladstones, Alexander, Archdeacon of St. Andrews, 347.
- Gladstones, George, Archbishop of St. Andrews, his appointment to the see of Caithness, ii. 278. Is translated to St. Andrews, 283. His consecration, 298. His death, 303.
- Glamis, John, Lord, his letter to Beza, ii. 200-202.
- Glasgow, Archbishopric of, its erection, i. 387, 388.
- Glasgow, Archdeacons of, i. 165, 166.
- Glasgow, Chapter of, i. 277 ; ii. 309.
- Glasgow, Church of, founded by St. Kentigern, i. 36. Becomes the centre of religion among the Cumbrian Britons, 41. Its restoration by Prince David, 219-222.
- Glasgow, General Assembly there in 1638, preparations for its meeting, iii. 20-31. Its proceedings, 35-49.
- Glasgow, Rural Deaneries of, i. 277.
- Glasgow, University of, its foundation, i. 378, 379. Its visitation in 1690, iii. 318, 319.
- Glasgow and Ayr, Synod of, its meeting in 1661, iii. 178.
- Glass, John, Minister at Tealing, iv. 55.
- Gleig, George, Bishop of Brechin, his election to the see of Dunkeld, iv. 99. Is again elected to that see, 124. Is appointed Bishop of Brechin, 125, 126. His charge to the clergy of Brechin, 126, 127. Is appointed Primus, 135. His letter to Bishop Jolly, 174, 175. Consecrates Bishop Luscombe, 178. Presides at the Synod of Laurencekirk, 181. Resigns the Primacy, 189. His death, 243.
- Glendonning, Matthew de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 358, 368.
- Glenluce, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 298.
- Goodman, Christopher, Minister at St. Andrews, ii. 80, 101.
- Gordon, Alexander, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 410.
- Gordon, Alexander, Bishop of Galloway and Archbishop of Athens, his appointment to the see of the Isles, ii. 31. Receives the title of Archbishop of Athens, 31. Appointed to the see of Galloway, 40. Joins the Protestants, 76. Petitions to be appointed Superintendent of Galloway, 112, 113. Is accused before the General Assembly, 191. His death, 200.

- Gordon, George, Bishop of Gal-
loway, ii. 200.
- Gordon, James, a Jesuit priest,
ii. 209, 264, 265.
- Gordon, James, Parson of Ban-
chory Devenick, publishes the
Reformed Bishop, iii. 272.
Account of that work, 272,
273. Is summoned before an
Episcopal Synod, 273. Is de-
posed, 273, 274. Is restored,
274. Petitions the Parliament
for a free General Assembly,
302, 303. Appears before the
Commission of the General As-
sembly at Aberdeen, 335.
Protests against its authority,
335.
- Gordon, John, Bishop of Gallo-
way, iii. 291, 312, 313.
- Gordon, Sir John, of Haddo, iii.
112, 113.
- Gordon, Robert, one of the Eng-
lish Nonjuring bishops, iv. 89,
90.
- Gordon, William, Bishop of Aber-
deen, ii. 17, 18, 54, 55, 200,
203.
- Gourlay, Norman, his death, ii.
10.
- Gowrie, John, Earl of, ii. 277,
278.
- Gowrie, William, Earl of, ii. 228,
229, 231.
- Graham, Andrew, Bishop of Dun-
blane, ii. 191, 192, 283.
- Graham, Archibald, Bishop of the
Isles, iii. 259, 313.
- Graham, George, Bishop of Ork-
ney, his appointment to the
see of Dunblane, ii. 283. His
translation to Orkney, 283. Is
deposed by the Glasgow As-
sembly, iii. 42. Submits to
the Covenanters, 57. Disclaims
his episcopal office, 62. Re-
marks by Bishop Hall on his
proceedings, 62.
- Graham, Patrick, Archbishop of
St. Andrews, his translation
from the see of Brechin to that
of St. Andrews, i. 376, 377.
Is raised to the dignity of
Archbishop and Metropolitan,
376-378. His deposition and
imprisonment, 385. His death,
385.
- Greenlaw, Gilbert, Bishop of Aber-
deen, i. 357, 359, 369.
- Greenshields, James, Clergyman
at Edinburgh, uses the Book
of Common Prayer, iii. 361.
Is summoned before the Pres-
bytery of Edinburgh, 361, 362.
His imprisonment, 362. Is
refused redress by the Court
of Session, 362. Appeals to
the House of Peers, 362. Is
released, 362.
- Gregory, Bishop of Brechin, i.
305, 320.
- Gregory, Bishop of Dunkeld, i.
265, 301.
- Gregory, Bishop of Murray, i.
219, 266.
- Gregory, Bishop of Ross, i. 304.
- Gregory, John, Minister at Drum-
oak, iii. 76.
- Greyson, John, Provincial of the
Black Friars, attends the Pro-
vincial Council of 1549, ii. 34.
Joins the Protestants, 77. His
formal recantation of Popery,
77, 78.

Grig, King of the Scots, i. 165, 166.

Griswold, Alexander V., Presiding Bishop of the American Church, communicates certain resolutions of the American Bishops to the Scottish Bishops, iv. 242, 243.

Guthrie, Henry, Bishop of Dunkeld, is minister at Stirling, iii. 71. Opposes private meetings for religious exercises, 71, 84. Is deposed, 136. Is appointed Bishop of Dunkeld, 226. His death, 254.

Guthrie, James, Minister at Stirling, his interview with Cromwell, iii. 36. Is a leader of the extreme Covenanting party, 149. Is deposed, 156. Is summoned to London by Cromwell, 162. Goes to London on behalf of the Protesters, 163. Is imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle, 173. His trial and death, 175, 176.

Guthrie, John, Bishop of Murray, ii. 330 ; iii. 42, 45, 53, 88, 89.

H.

Haco, Earl of Orkney, i. 247-252.

Haddington, Nunnery at, its foundation, i. 288.

Haldane, James, iv. 169, 170.

Haldane, Robert, iv. 169, 170.

Haliburton, George, Bishop of Aberdeen, iii. 254, 276, 311, 312.

Haliburton, George, Bishop of Dunkeld, iii. 197, 226.

Hamilton, David, Bishop of Argyll, i. 411 ; ii. 7.

Hamilton, Gavin, Abbot of Kilwinning, ii. 38, 86.

Hamilton, Gavin, Bishop of Galloway, ii. 286, 296, 297, 300.

Hamilton, James, Bishop of Argyll, i. 42, 238.

Hamilton, James, Bishop of Galloway, iii. 192, 195, 248.

Hamilton, James, Duke of, appointed High Commissioner to Scotland by Charles I., iii. 7. Arrives in Scotland, 9, 10. Publishes the royal declaration, 11. Repairs to London, 17. Returns to Scotland, 17. Advises the King to authorise the Negative Confession, 19, 20. Proclaims the King's concessions, 22. Comes to Glasgow to hold the General Assembly, 31. Attends the Assembly as Royal Commissioner, 36. Urges the reading of the Bishops' Declinature, 37. Dissolves the Assembly, 38, 39. Leaves the Assembly, 39. Writes to the King, 50, 52. His visit to Archbishop Spottiswood, 66. Is defeated by Cromwell, 135. His death, 138.

Hamilton, John, Archbishop of St. Andrews, his appointment to the see of Dunkeld, ii. 17. Is raised to the Primacy, 30. Presides at the Provincial Councils of 1549 and 1552, 33, 36. His illness, 38. Summons the Provincial Council of 1559, 55. Attends the Parliament of 1560, 84. Votes against the Confession of Faith, 86. Is tried for hearing con-

- fessions and assisting at Mass, 134. Baptizes Prince James, 153. Is restored to his consistorial jurisdiction, 154. His death, 168. His character, 169.
- Hamilton, John, Bishop of Dunkeld, iii. 284, 311.
- Hamilton, Patrick, Abbot of Ferne, his birth, ii. 8. His appointment to the abbacy of Ferne, 8. Studies in Germany and embraces the Lutheran opinions, 8. Returns to Scotland, 8. His imprisonment and death, 8, 9.
- Hamilton, Robert, Minister at Glassford, presents the Bishops' Declinature at the Glasgow Assembly, iii. 37, 38. Is deposed by the Assembly, 47. Is nominated to the see of Caithness, 57.
- Hanna, George, Dean of Edinburgh, ii. 385 ; iii. 87.
- Harlaw, William, a Protestant preacher, ii. 42, 48.
- Harold, Bishop of Argyll, i. 301, 322.
- Harvey, Marion, her death, iii. 262.
- Haufr, Bishop of Orkney, i. 325, 337.
- Hay, Edmund, a Jesuit priest, ii. 152, 209, 246.
- Hay, George, a Protestant preacher, ii. 122, 123.
- Hay, James, Bishop of Ross, ii. 6, 18.
- Hay, William, Bishop of Murray, iii. 286, 312.
- Heathored, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 124.
- Henderson, Alexander, Minister at Edinburgh, petitions against the Liturgy, ii. 390. Assists in preparing a complaint against the Bishops, 404. Assists in drawing up the National Covenant, iii. 2. Disputes with the Doctors of Aberdeen, 13-16. Account of his early life, 34, 35. Is chosen Moderator of the Glasgow Assembly, 36. Reads the sentences of deposition and excommunication against the Bishops, 48. Receives the deanery of the chapel-royal, 87. Is one of the Commissioners of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 99. His share in the conferences at Uxbridge, 116. His controversial correspondence with the King, 117-121. His death, 121. His alleged recantation, 121. His character, 121, 122.
- Henry, son of David I., i. 275, 278, 279.
- Henry I., Bishop of Galloway, i. 336, 349.
- Henry II., Bishop of Galloway, i. 349, 354.
- Henry III., Bishop of Galloway, ii. 7, 19.
- Henry I., Bishop of Orkney, i. 337.
- Henry II., Bishop of Orkney, i. 361, 371.
- Henry, Bishop of Ross, i. 380, 391.
- Hepburn, Alexander, Bishop of Ross, ii. 191.
- Hepburn, George, Bishop of the Isles, i. 412.

- Hepburn, James, Bishop of Murray, i. 402, 403 ; ii. 4.
- Hepburn, John, Bishop of Brechin, i. 410 ; ii. 6, 39.
- Hepburn, John, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 381, 391.
- Hepburn, John, Prior of St. Andrews, founds St. Leonard's College, i. 396, 397.
- Hepburn, Patrick, Bishop of Murray, ii. 4, 191.
- Herbert, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 265, 300.
- Heriot, Adam, Minister at Aberdeen, ii. 80.
- Higbald, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 123, 124.
- High Commission Court, erected by King James VI., ii. 291, 292. New warrant for it by King Charles I., 368, 369. Its restoration by King Charles II., iii. 221. Account of its proceedings, 221, 222.
- Hilda, Abbess of Whitby, i. 79, 85, 89, 103.
- Hill, George, Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, iv. 149, 152, 153.
- Himba, Monastery in, i. 56.
- Hobart, John Henry, Bishop of New York, his visit to Scotland, iv. 175. His interview with Bishop Jolly, 175, 176.
- Hog, James, Minister at Carnock, iv. 53.
- Holmcultram, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 275, 276.
- Holyrood, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 272.
- Holywood, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 273, 274.
- Home, Henry, Lord Kames, iv. 80, 81.
- Home, John, Minister at Athelstaneford, his motion in the General Assembly of 1751, iv. 77. Performance of his Tragedy of Douglas, 82. Resigns his charge, 82, 83.
- Honeyman, Andrew, Bishop of Orkney, iii. 215, 231, 254.
- Hook, Walter Farquhar, Dean of Chichester, iv. 179.
- Horsley, Heneage, Dean of Brechin, iv. 132, 192.
- Horsley, Samuel, Bishop of St. Asaph, his assistance to the Scottish bishops in obtaining a repeal of the penal laws, iv. 103. His speech in the House of Lords, 107, 108.
- Hugh, Bishop of Argyll, i. 322.
- Hugh, Bishop of Brechin, i. 305.
- Hugh, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 293-295.
- Hume, David, proposal to censure his writings, and to summon him before the General Assembly, iv. 81.
- Hungus, son of Urgust, King of the Picts, i. 119, 123, 124.
- Huntly, George, first Marquis of, his revolt and excommunication, ii. 263. Retires to the Continent, 264, 265. Is absolved from the sentence of excommunication, 274. Is again excommunicated, 290, 303. His absolution by Archbishop Abbot, 303, 304. His death, iii. 9.
- Huntly, George, second Marquis of, is educated in the principles

- of the Church of England, iii. 9. Refuses the solicitations of the Covenanters, 9. Publishes the royal declaration at Aberdeen, 24. Receives a commission of lieutenancy from the King, 55, 56. Is carried prisoner to Edinburgh, 56. Again takes arms for the King, 112. Is again imprisoned, 140. His death, 141.
- Hutchieson, George, Minister at Edinburgh, iii. 211, 231, 248.
- Hutchinson, John, opinions of, iv. 113. Their influence in Scotland, 113, 114.
- I.
- Inchaffray, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 298.
- Inchcolm, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 218.
- Indrecht, Abbot of Iona, i. 126, 128, 168.
- Indulf, son of Constantine, King of the Scots, i. 175.
- Ingelram, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 287, 288, 300.
- Inglis, John, Minister at Edinburgh, iv. 153, 201.
- Innerpeffrey, Malcolm de, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 331, 334.
- Innes, George, Bishop of Brechin, iv. 89, 91.
- Innes, John, Bishop of Murray, i. 368.
- Innes, Thomas, his birth and ordination, iii. 344. Publication of his Critical Essay, 344. His death, 344.
- Inverkeithing, Richard de, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 331, 334.
- Iona, Monastery of, founded by St. Columba, i. 51. Ceases to be the seat of the Primacy, 129-131. Account of its ecclesiastical government, 134-143. Doctrines and ritual during its Primacy, 144-160. Last notices of it in the Irish Annalists, 298, 299.
- Irvine, Sir Alexander, of Drum, refuses to subscribe the Covenant, iii. 164. Is threatened with ecclesiastical censures, 164. Appeals to the commander of the English troops, 164. His letter to the Presbytery of Aberdeen, 164, 165. His protestation against the sentence of the Presbytery, 165, 166.
- Irvine, William, one of the College Bishops, iii. 380, 381, 394, 398.
- Irving, Edward, Minister at London, his popularity as a preacher, iv. 197. His writings are censured by the Presbytery of London, 197. They are censured by the General Assembly, 197, 198. He is cited before the Presbytery of Annan, 198. His trial and deposition, 198, 199. His death, 199.
- Isles, the, Chapter of the see of, ii. 309, 310 ; iii. 201.
- J.
- Jaffray, Alexander, Provost of Aberdeen, iii. 144, 146, 163, 268.
- James I., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 362. Assumes the government of the kingdom,

362. His vigorous rule, 363. His civil and ecclesiastical reforms, 363. His death and character, 363, 364.
- James II., King of the Scots, i. 372, 373.
- James III., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 373. Acquires Orkney for Scotland by his marriage with Margaret of Denmark, 373. His death, 383. His ecclesiastical policy, 383, 384.
- James IV., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 384. Erects the chapel royal at Stirling, 393. His good government, 393. His death and character, 394.
- James V., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 394. Assumes the government, ii. 1. Institutes the College of Justice, 2. Refuses the proposals of King Henry VIII., 15. His death and character, 15, 16.
- James VI., King of the Scots, his birth and baptism, ii. 153. His coronation, 160. His attachment to the Duke of Lennox, 207, 208. Signs the Confession of 1581, 213. Is seized at Ruthven Castle, 228. Escapes from restraint, 231. Establishes the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, 235, 236. Intercedes for his mother, 243. His indignation on her execution, 245. Is reconciled to Queen Elizabeth, 246. Suppresses the insurrection of the Roman Catholic nobles, 247. Marries Anne of Denmark, 247.
- His alleged speech at the General Assembly of 1590, 252. Suppresses a tumult at Edinburgh, 266-269. His questions on the ecclesiastical polity, 272, 273. Publishes the Basilicon Doron, 276. His accession to the English crown, 279. Leaves Scotland, 279. His coronation in Westminster Abbey, 280. Summons several of the Scottish bishops and ministers to London, 287. His treatment of the Presbyterian ministers, 289. Erects a Court of High Commission, 291. Summons three of the Scottish bishops to London, 296. His instructions to the clergy, 298, 299. Visits Scotland, 307. His conversation with Calderwood, 308. His return to England, 310. His death, 333. His civil and ecclesiastical policy, 333, 334. His alleged conversation with Bishop Williams, 376.
- James II., King of Great Britain, his accession, iii. 280. Endeavours to obtain a repeal of the laws against the Roman Catholics, 283, 284. Grants an indulgence to the Presbyterians and Roman Catholics, 286. Suspends the penal laws and grants a toleration, 286, 287. His abdication, 292. His death, 340.
- James, Prince of Wales, son of James II., lands in Scotland, iii. 373. His character, 373. Receives an address from the

- clergy of Aberdeen, 374.
 Agreement between him and the Scottish bishops, iv. 11, 12.
 His death, 88.
- Jedburgh, Church of, given to the Church of Lindisfarne, i. 124.
- Jedburgh, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 272, 273.
- Joceline, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 290, 293, 294, 300.
- Jofreir, Bishop of Orkney, i. 307, 325.
- John, King of the Scots, i. 338, 339.
- John, Abbot of Brechin, i. 242.
- John, Bishop of Argyll, i. 391, 411.
- John, Bishop of Caithness, i. 304, 315.
- John I., Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 302.
- John II., Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 352, 358.
- John the Scot, Bishop of Dunkeld, his election to the see of St. Andrews, i. 293. His appointment resisted by King William the Lion, 293. Appeals to the Pope, 294. Arrangement of the dispute, 294, 295. Is appointed Bishop of Dunkeld, 295. Erects the see of Argyll, 301, 302. His death, 302.
- John, Bishop of Galloway, i. 306.
- John, Bishop of Glasgow, his appointment to the see, i. 220. Refuses obedience to the Archbishop of York, 222. Is suspended, 222. Appeals to the Pope, 222. Goes on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, 223. Returns to Scotland, 223.
- Account of his administration, 261, 264, 265. His death, 265.
- John I., Bishop of the Isles, i. 392, 412.
- John II., Bishop of the Isles, i. 412 ; ii. 7.
- John I., Bishop of Man, i. 270.
- John II., Bishop of Man, 'i. 324.
- John III., Bishop of Man, i. 360, 370.
- John, Bishop of Orkney, i. 371.
- John I., Bishop of Ross, i. 348, 353.
- John II., Bishop of Ross, i. 369, 380.
- Johnstone, Sir Archibald, of Warriston, assists in drawing up the National Covenant, iii. 2. Is chosen clerk to the Glasgow Assembly, 36. Is made a judge and knighted, 86, 87. Opposes the royal cause, 95. Exhorts the Estates to do justice on Malignants, 114. Goes to London on behalf of the Protesters, 163. Warrants are issued against him at the Restoration, 172. His attainder, 176, 177. His death, 214.
- Jolly, Alexander, Bishop of Murray, his birth and education, iv. 114. His ordination, 114. His consecration, 114. His appointment to the see of Murray, 114. His speech at the Convocation of Laurencekirk, 116-120. His interview with Bishop Hobart, 175, 176. Objects to some of the proceedings of the Synod of Laurence-

kirk, 186. His death, 190. His character, 190, 191. His writings, 191.
Jonathan, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 305, 306, 320.

K.

Keith, George, iii. 344.

Keith, Robert, Bishop of Caithness, his consecration, iii. 399. Assists in bringing about a reconciliation between the Diocesan and the College Bishops, iv. 7, 8. Is appointed Bishop of Caithness, Orkney, and the Isles, 8. Is elected Bishop by the clergy of Fife, 9. Is appointed Primus, 13. His death, 47. His writings, 47.

Kellach I., Abbot of Iona, i. 125.

Kellach II., Abbot of Iona, i. 168.

Kellach, Bishop of the Mercians, i. 85.

Kellach I., Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 167, 172, 173.

Kellach II., Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 177.

Kelso, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 274, 275.

Kennedy, James, Bishop of St. Andrews, his appointment to the see of Dunkeld, i. 368. His translation to St. Andrews, 374. Founds the College of St. Salvator, 375. His virtues, 375. His death, 375.

Kennedy, Quintin, Abbot of Crossraguel, attends the Provincial Council of 1549, ii. 34. Publishes his *Compendious Tractive*, 60-63. His controversy

with Willock, 64. His controversy with Hay, 122, 123. Publishes his *Oration*, 123. His controversy with Knox, 124-126. His death, 127.

Kenneth, son of Alpin, King of the Scots, his accession, i. 128. Is acknowledged King of the Picts, 129. Transfers the primacy from Iona to Dunkeld, 129-131. His death, 164.

Kenneth, son of Malcolm, King of the Scots, his accession, i. 177. Dedicates the Church of Brechin, 177. Subdues Cumbria, 178, 179. His death, 179.

Kenneth, son of Duff, King of the Scots, i. 181.

Kentigern, St., authorities for his life, i. 34, 35. His birth, 35, 36. His education by St. Serf, 36. His consecration, 36. His residence at Glasgow, 37. Retires to Wales, 37, 38. Returns to Glasgow, 38. His interview with St. Columba, 39. His death, 39, 40.

Kilgour, Robert, Bishop of Aberdeen, iv. 88, 90, 91, 93, 99.

Killen Droichteach, Abbot of Iona, i. 119, 120, 122.

Killen Fada, Abbot of Iona, i. 119.

Kilwinning, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 275.

Kingarth, Monastery of, i. 133.

Kinloss, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 275.

Kirkwall, Church of, its foundation, i. 251.

Knox, Andrew, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 287, 322, 338.

Knox, John, his birth and education, ii. 31. His ordination, 31. Embraces the Protestant opinions, 31. His residence in the Castle of St. Andrews, 32. Accepts a call to be a Protestant minister, 32. His controversies with the clergy, 32, 33. Is carried prisoner to France, 33. Is released from captivity, 43. Preaches in England, 43. Declines to accept the bishopric of Rochester, 43. Leaves England, 43. Becomes a minister at Frankfort, 44. Publishes his Faithful Admonition, 44. Becomes a minister at Geneva, 44. Returns to Scotland, 44. Is present at a conference of the Protestant leaders, 45. Preaches in various parts of Scotland, 45. Writes his Letter to the Queen Regent, 46. Returns to Geneva, 46, 47. Is summoned by the Scottish bishops, 47. Publishes his Appellation, 47, 48. Publishes his First Blast of the Trumpet against the Regiment of Women, 65. Returns to Scotland, 66. Goes with the Protestant leaders to Perth, 66. Preaches against idolatry, 67. Preaches at St. Andrews, 70. Advises the deposition of the Queen Regent, 73. His exertions in the cause of the Congregation, 74. Is appointed minister at Edinburgh, 80. Assists in compiling the Confession of Faith, 91. His dispute

with the clergy of Aberdeen, 101, 102. Stirs up the people against idolatry, 108. His interview with Queen Mary, 108-110. Declines a controversy with Winzet, 121. His controversy with Kennedy, 124-126. His second interview with Queen Mary, 130, 131. His third interview with Queen Mary, 132, 133. Preaches against the Queen's marriage, 134, 135. Is summoned before the Council, 137, 138. Is again summoned before the Council, 144. Examination of the charges against him in connection with the murder of Riccio, 149-151. Preaches at the coronation of James VI., 160. His correspondence with Cecil, 166. Declines to inaugurate Archbishop Douglas, 181. Has an attack of apoplexy, 182. His residence at St. Andrews, 182. His controversy with Tyrie, 182. Returns to Edinburgh, 183. His last illness, 183. His conversation with his friends, 184. His death, 185. His character, 185-187. His History of the Reformation, 188.

Knox, Thomas, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 322, 337.

Kyninmund, Alexander, I., Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 344, 347, 353.

Kyninmund, Alexander, II., Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 353, 359.

Kyninmund, John de, Bishop of Brechin, i. 348.

L.

Laing, John, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 387.

Laisrean, Abbot of Iona, i. 70.

Lamb, Andrew, Bishop of Galloway, ii. 290, 296, 297, 321, 353.

Lamberton, William, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 343-345.

Lambley, Ralph de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 317, 318.

Lanark, Adam de, Bishop of Galloway, i. 354, 360.

Landel, William de, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 352, 357.

Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, accompanies King James to Scotland, ii. 307. Accompanies King Charles to Scotland, 344. Visits St. Andrews and Dunblane, 346, 347. Recommends the adoption of the English Liturgy by the Scottish Church, 377. Writes to the Earl of Traquair, 388. Writes to the Marquis of Hamilton, iii. 52, 53. Writes to the Swiss pastors, 54, 55. Proceedings against him, 111. His death, 112.

Lauder, Alexander, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 379.

Lauder, George, Bishop of Argyll, i. 370, 381.

Lander, Thomas, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 379, 390.

Lauder, William, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 368.

Lauderdale, John, Duke of, carries the answer of the General Assembly of 1642 to the King and the parliament, iii. 94. His nego-

tiations with King Charles I., 130, 131. Advises King Charles II. to sign the Covenant, 142. Accompanies the King to Scotland, 146. Is made prisoner at Worcester, 156. Is appointed Secretary of State, 173. Advises the King to maintain Presbyterianism, 183. His ascendancy in Scotland, 213. Is appointed Royal Commissioner, 232. Procures an act affirming the ecclesiastical supremacy of the sovereign, 233. Opposes the calling of a National Synod, 249. His conduct at Mitchell's trial, 255. His death, 279.

Laurencekirk, Convocation of, iv. 115-121.

Laurie, Robert, Bishop of Brechin, iii. 211, 242, 249, 250, 254.

Law, James, Archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 287, 303, 338.

Lawrence, Abbot of Abernethy, i. 242.

Lawrence, Bishop of Argyll, i. 336, 349.

Lawrence, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 268, 305.

Lawrence, Bishop of Man, i. 324, 325, 336.

Lawrence of Lindores, i. 365, 366.

Lawson, James, Minister at Edinburgh, ii. 183, 184, 271.

Leighton, Robert, Archbishop of Glasgow, his birth and education, iii. 192, 193. Is appointed minister at Newbottle, 193. Supports the engagement in favour of King Charles I., 193

- Is appointed Principal of the College of Edinburgh, 194.
- Is nominated to the see of Dunblane, 194. His letter to James Aird, 194, 195. His opinion as to ordination, 195. His consecration, 196. Holds his diocesan synod in 1662, 202-204. Wishes to resign his see, 222, 223. Holds his diocesan synod in 1666, 226, 227. Proposes a comprehension of the Presbyterians, 230. Is appointed Commendator of Glasgow, 236. Holds a diocesan synod at Glasgow, 236. His conference with the Presbyterian ministers, 237. Sends six clergymen to preach in the western counties, 237, 238. His second conference with the Presbyterian ministers, 238, 239. His propositions to them, 239, 240. His final conference with them, 240. His address to them, 240, 241. Resigns the see of Dunblane, 244. Is appointed Archbishop of Glasgow, 244. Writes to his clergy, 244, 245. Resigns his archbishopric, 245. His residence in Sussex, 245. His death, 246. His character, 246, 247.
- Leith, Convention of superintendents and ministers at, ii. 175, 176. Arrangements agreed to by its Commissioners, 176-179.
- Lennox, Matthew, Earl of, ii. 166-170.
- Lennox, Esmé, Duke of, ii. 207-209, 213, 226-228, 230.
- Leod, Abbot of Brechin, i. 242.
- Leslie Controversy, account of, iv. 154, 155.
- Leslie, John, Bishop of Ross, is Parson of Mortlach, ii. 55. As a member of the chapter of Aberdeen advises a reformation of abuses, 55. Is summoned before the Estates, 101, 102. Is sent to France by the Roman Catholic leaders, 104. His interview with Queen Mary, 104. Is appointed Bishop of Ross, 146, 147. Discovers Murray's designs against the Queen, 166. His death and character, 265.
- Leslie, John, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 337.
- Leslie, William, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, ii. 372 ; iii. 56, 74, 78.
- Lethendy Case, account of, iv. 212, 213.
- Leuchars, Patrick de, Bishop of Brechin, i. 353, 359.
- Lichton, Henry de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 368, 369, 380.
- Lincluden, Nunnery of, its foundation, i. 288.
- Lindisfarne, Church and Monastery of, founded by Aidan, i. 77.
- Lindores, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 297.
- Lindsay, Alexander, Bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 290 ; iii. 43, 62, 87.
- Lindsay, David, Bishop of Ross, ii. 80, 180, 235, 247, 278, 300.
- Lindsay, David, Bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 321, 324, 353, 385 ; iii. 42, 44, 88.

- Lindsay, Ingleram de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 380.
- Lindsay, John de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 345, 352.
- Lindsay, Patrick, Archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 300, 338, 389 ; iii. 42, 45, 88.
- Lindsay, William, Bishop of Brechin, iii. 254, 259.
- Linlithgow, Councils of, ii. 33-35, 38.
- Lismahago, Priory of, its foundation, i. 275.
- Linton, Bernard de, Bishop of Man, i. 349, 354.
- Livingstone, James, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 390.
- Livingstone, John, Minister at Anerum, his birth and education, ii. 342. Is appointed minister at Killinshie, 342. His ordination, 342. Is suspended, 343. Is deposed, 343. Sails for New England, 344. His return, 344. Goes to London as an envoy from the Covenanters, iii. 4, 5. Is appointed minister at Strauraer, 34. Is a member of the Glasgow Assembly, 34. Is one of the commissioners at Breda, 144. Is summoned to London by Cromwell, 162. Goes to London on behalf of the Protesters, 163. Is summoned before the Privy Council, 210. His banishment, 211. His death, 211.
- Loch-Awe, Monastery near, i. 58.
- Lochleven, Monastery of, its foundation, i. 132, 133. Is made over to the Bishop of St. Andrews, 175. Account of its Library, 234. Is changed into a Priory of Canons-Regular, 263, 264.
- Logie, Andrew, Archdeacon of Aberdeen, iii. 39, 72, 76.
- Logie, Gavin, Principal of St. Leonard's College, ii. 12.
- Logie, Robert, Canon of Cambuskenneth, ii. 13.
- Lollards, the, their opinions introduced into Scotland, i. 365. They are persecuted, 365-367. Proceedings against them, 389.
- Lothian, Synod of, its meeting in 1661, iii. 180.
- Loudon, John, Earl of, ii. 405 ; iii. 2, 34, 83, 86, 130, 205, 206.
- Low, David, Bishop of Murray, iv. 136, 179, 186, 191, 250, 251, 270.
- Lumsden, Andrew, Bishop of Edinburgh, iii. 399 ; iv. 6, 8.
- Luscombe, Matthew, missionary bishop, iv. 178-180, 252-255.

M.

- M'Alpine, John, ii. 11.
- Macbeth, King of the Scots, his accession, i. 184. His good government, 185. His pilgrimage to Rome, 185. His death, 185.
- Macbeth, Bishop of Ross, i. 266.
- M'Crie, Thomas, Minister at Edinburgh, his Life of Knox, iv. 153. Dissents from the new Testimony of the Antiburgher Synod, 160. Is deposed, 163. His death, 235.

- M'Culloch, William, minister at Cambuslang, iv. 70.
- Macfarlane, Andrew, Bishop of Ross, iv. 99-101, 114, 116, 136.
- M'Gill, William, Minister at Ayr, iv. 146, 147.
- M'Kail, Hugh, a Presbyterian preacher, iii. 228.
- Mackenzie, Murdoch, Bishop of Orkney, iii. 197, 254, 291.
- Mackenzie, Thomas, Archdeacon of Ross, iii. 39, 47.
- Mackoul, Duncan, founder of Ardhattan, i. 314.
- M'Lachlan, Ferquhard, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 7, 18.
- M'Lachlan, Margaret, her death, iii. 281, 282.
- Maclean, Hector, Bishop of Argyll, iii. 259, 291.
- M'Lean, Lachlan, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 156.
- Maclean, Roderick, Bishop of the Isles, ii. 19, 31.
- M'Lellan, Gilbert, Bishop of Man, i. 349.
- Macnaughton, Donald, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 368.
- Maddox, Isaac, Bishop of Worcester, his speech on the bill imposing penalties on the Episcopal clergy, iv. 40.
- Maelbrigid I., Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 176.
- Maelbrigid II., Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 181.
- Maelbrigid I., Abbot of Iona, i. 186.
- Maelbrigid II., Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Maelciarain, Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Magnus, St., Earl of Orkney, account of, i. 247-250.
- Mair, John, Provost of St. Salvador's College, ii. 3, 12, 33.
- Maitland, William, of Lethington, ii. 44, 84, 91, 137, 189, 190.
- Malcolm I., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 174. Acquires Cumberland from Edmund, King of England, 174, 175.
- Malcolm II., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 181. Acquires the Merse and Teviotdale, 182, 183. His death, 184.
- Malcolm III., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 186. His coronation, 188. His marriage with Margaret of England, 189, 190. Found the monastery of Mortlach, 193. Promotes the civilization of the Scots, 197-199. His death, 199.
- Malcolm IV., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 286. His government, 286, 287. His death, 288. His ecclesiastical foundations, 288.
- Malcolm, Earl of Fife, i. 313.
- Malcolm, Bishop of Caithness, i. 353, 359.
- Malduin, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 184.
- Malmore, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 181.
- Malmore, Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Malruba, St., founds the church of Applecross, i. 99. His death, 99.
- Malvoisin, William, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 296, 297, 300, 301, 308, 316.
- Man, Isle of, conversion of its inhabitants, i. 254, 255.

- Manuel, Nunnery of, its foundation, i. 288.
- Mar, John, Earl of, Regent of Scotland, ii. 171, 172, 174.
- March, Patrick, Earl of, i. 351.
- Marcus, Bishop of Man, i. 337, 349.
- Margaret, St., her marriage with King Malcolm, i. 189, 190. Her good works, 190-192. Her munificence, 192, 193. Reforms the Scottish Church, 194-197. Her illness and death, 199-201. Is canonized, 202.
- Margaret, grand-daughter of King Alexander III., i. 338.
- Markinch, Church of, given to the monastery of Lochleven, i. 184.
- Marnoch Case, account of, iv. 213, 214, 216, 217.
- Marriage of ecclesiastics, practice of Columba and his disciples regarding it, i. 148, 149. Practice of the Culdees regarding it, 236-239.
- Marrow of Modern Divinity, its republication, iv. 53. Controversy regarding it, 53, 54.
- Martin, Bishop of Argyll, i. 354, 360.
- Mary of Lorraine, is appointed regent, ii. 30. Her government, 39. Promises toleration to the Protestants, 54. Forbids their worship, 65. Agrees to an accommodation, 70. Is deprived by the Protestants, 73. Her death, 76.
- Mary, Queen of the Scots, her accession, ii. 16. Her marriage with Francis the Dauphin, 39. Her return to Scotland, 105. Difficulties of her position, 106. Her interview with Knox, 108-110. Suppresses the rebellion of Huntly, 128-130. Her second interview with Knox, 130, 131. Her third interview with Knox, 132, 133. Her marriage with Darnley, 140-142. Suppresses the rebellion of Murray, 143. Is seized by the assassins of Riccio, 149. Effects her escape, 149. Declines to receive a papal nuncio, 152, 153. Is suspected of participation in Darnley's murder, 155. Her marriage with Bothwell, 156, 157. Her imprisonment at Lochleven, 157. Her forced abdication, 158, 159. Her escape from Lochleven, 163. Defeat of her army at Langside, 163. Seeks refuge in England, 163. Her trial and condemnation, 241-243. Her death, 244.
- Matthew, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 293, 294, 304.
- Matthew I., Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 317.
- Matthew II., Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 334, 346.
- Matthew, Bishop of Ross, i. 335.
- Maurice, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 348, 353.
- Maxwell, John, Bishop of Ross, his appointment to the see, ii. 338. Assists in drawing up the Prayer Book of 1637, 377. Writes to the Marquis of Hamilton, iii. 32, 33. Is deposed

- and excommunicated by the Glasgow Assembly, 42, 45. Is appointed Bishop of Killala, 89, 90. Is attacked by the Irish insurgents, 90. Is translated to the archbishopric of Tuam, 90. His death, 90, 91.
- Maxwell, Robert, Bishop of Orkney, ii. 6, 18.
- Mearns, Duncan, Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen, iv. 207, 233.
- Meldrum, George, Minister at Edinburgh, iii. 205, 267, 338, 346.
- Meldrum, William, Bishop of Brechin, i. 391, 410.
- Melrose, Monastery of, its foundation, i. 79. Is burnt by King Kenneth, 162. Is replaced by a Cistercian Abbey, 275.
- Melville, Andrew, his birth and education, ii. 194, 195. His residence at Geneva, 195. His return to Scotland, 195. Is appointed Principal of the College of Glasgow, 195. Attacks the episcopal form of government, 195, 196. Is appointed Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, 227. Attacks the supremacy of the crown, 227. Defies the Earl of Arran, 228. Is summoned before the council, 231. Flees to England, 231. Denounces Archbishop Adamson, 234. Answers the declaration drawn up by the Archbishop, 237. His treatment of the Archbishop, 257, 259. Rebukes King James, 263. Is summoned by the King to London, 287. Is committed prisoner to the Tower, 289. Is released, 328. Is appointed Professor of Divinity at Sedan, 328. His death and character, 328.
- Melville, James, Minister at Killyrenny, animadverts on the conduct of Archbishop Adamson, ii. 240. His sermon at the General Assembly of 1590, 251, 252. His defence of the privileges of the Church, 284-286. Is summoned to London by King James, 287. Is detained in England, 289. His death, 328.
- Menzies, John, Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen, iii. 155, 162, 163, 265.
- Methven, Paul, Minister at Jedburgh, ii. 48, 53, 80, 132.
- Michael, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 358.
- Michael, Bishop of Galloway, i. 354.
- Michael, Bishop of the Isles, i. 370.
- Michael, Bishop of Man, i. 306.
- Middleton, George, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, iii. 321, 376.
- Middleton, John, Earl of, iii. 132, 154, 156, 173, 174, 182, 199, 207, 213.
- Millar, Arthur, Bishop of Edinburgh, iii. 380, 394, 398, 399; iv. i. 5, 6.
- Mitchell, David, Bishop of Aberdeen, is one of the ministers of Edinburgh, iii. 5. His letter

- to Bishop Leslie of Raphoe, 5. Is deprived by the Glasgow Assembly, 46. Is appointed Bishop of Aberdeen, 198. Holds his diocesan synod, 204, 205. His death, 212.
- Mitchell, James, a Presbyterian preacher, iii. 231, 254, 255.
- Mitchelson, Margaret, her imposture, iii. 23, 24.
- Moffat, Nicholas de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 333.
- Moir, David, Bishop of Brechin, iv. 190, 243, 251.
- Moncreiff, Sir Henry, Minister at Edinburgh, iv. 153.
- Moncrieff, Alexander, Minister at Abernethy, iv. 58.
- Monro, Alexander, Principal of the College of Edinburgh, is nominated to the see of Argyll, iii. 291. Charges against him at the visitation of the College, 319, 320. His ejection, 320. His death, 320.
- Montgomery, Robert, Archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 226, 228.
- Montgomery, Robert, Bishop of Argyll, ii. 7, 31.
- Montrose, James, Marquis of, iii. 13, 34, 83, 112-114, 142, 144, 146.
- Monymusk, Culdee monastery at, i. 316.
- Moravia, Andrew de, Bishop of Murray, i. 304, 317.
- Moravia, David de, Bishop of Murray, i. 347.
- Morgrund, Abbot of Brechin, i. 242.
- Mortlach, Monastery of, its foundation, i. 193. Is given to the Church of Aberdeen, 266.
- Morton, James, Earl of, Regent of Scotland, ii. 171, 176, 184, 185, 189, 202, 203, 207, 208.
- Morville, Hugh de, i. 274, 275.
- Mugron, Abbot of Iona, i. 186.
- Muirhead, Andrew, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 379, 387.
- Muredach, Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Murray, Bishopric of, its foundation, i. 218.
- Murray, Chapter of, i. 277, 303, 317.
- Murray, Rural Deaneries of, i. 277.
- Murray, James, Earl of, as Prior of St. Andrews attends the Provincial Council of 1549, ii. 34. Is one of Knox's hearers, 45. Joins the Congregation, 70. His interview with Queen Mary in France, 104. Checks a riot of the Protestants in Edinburgh, 107. His rebellion, 143. Is appointed Regent, 161. His designs against Mary, 166. His death, 166.
- Mylne, Alexander, Abbot of Cambuskenneth, i. 399, 400; ii. 3, 4.
- Mylne, Walter, Vicar of Lunan, his death, ii. 51, 52.

N.

- Nairn, James, Minister at Holyrood, is one of Archbishop Leighton's preachers in the western counties, iii. 237. His character, 237, 238.
- National Synod, act of King Charles II. for its constitution, iii. 216.

- Nectan, King of the Picts, introduces the Roman usages among his subjects, i. 114-117. Sends for architects to the Abbot Ceolfrid, 117. Banishes the family of Iona, 118, 119. His death, 119.
- Nectan, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 266.
- New Abbey, its foundation, i. 330, 331.
- Newbottle, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 275.
- Nicholas, Bishop of Caithness, i. 353.
- Nicholas, Bishop of Man, i. 306, 307, 322.
- Nicholson, Thomas, Bishop of Peristochium, iii. 344.
- Nicolson, James, Bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 290.
- Ninian, St., authorities for his life, i. 10, 11. His birth, 11. His residence at Rome, 12. His consecration, 12. Visits St. Martin at Tours, 12. Returns to Britain and builds Candida Casa, 12-14. Converts the Southern Picts, 15-18. Miracles ascribed to him, 18, 19. His death, 20.
- Ninian, Bishop of Galloway, i. 381, 392.
- Norrie, Robert, one of the College Bishops, iii. 395-397, 399.
- Northampton, Council of, i. 290, 291.
- North Berwick, Nunnery at, its foundation, i. 288.
- O.
- Ochiltree, Michael, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 369, 381.
- Ochterlonie, John, Bishop of Brechin, iii. 396; iv. 8-10, 12.
- Ogilvie, John, a Jesuit priest, is apprehended at Glasgow, ii. 300, 301. Declines to give an answer regarding the deposing power of the Pope, 301. His trial and condemnation, 301, 302. His death, 302.
- Olave, King of Man, i. 270-272.
- Ordinal of 1620, ii. 322-324.
- Ordinal of 1636, ii. 368.
- Ordination, opinion of Columba and his disciples regarding it, i. 152-160.
- Original Burgher Synod, its formation, iv. 165. Its union with the Established Church, 211, 212.
- Orkney, conversion of its inhabitants, i. 56, 245, 246.
- Orkney, Chapter of, ii. 41.
- Orm, Abbot of Abernethy, i. 242.
- Osbert, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 320.
- Oswald, King of Northumbria, seeks refuge in Northern Britain, i. 71. Returns to Northumbria and is acknowledged as King, 74, 75. Sends to the Scots for a bishop, 75. Receives Aidan from them, 76. Gives Lindisfarne to Aidan for his see, 77. Acts as interpreter between Aidan and the Northumbrians, 78. His death, 80.
- Oswald, Bishop of Galloway, i. 360.
- Oswin, King of Deira, i. 80, 81.
- Oswy, King of Northumbria, succeeds King Oswald, 80. Per-

suades Sigebert, King of the East Saxons, to become a Christian, 85. Attends the Council of Whitby, 89-93. Obtains the appointment of Theodore to the see of Canterbury, 100. His death, 101.

P.

Paisley, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 288, 289.

Palladius, St., is consecrated by Pope Celestine, and sent to the Scots as their first bishop, i. 23. Arrives in Ireland, 23. Leaves Ireland and arrives in the country of the Southern Picts, 23. His residence and labours there, 24, 25. His death, 25. Disputes regarding his mission to the Scots, 25-28.

Palmer, William, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, iv. 252-262.

Panter, David, Bishop of Ross, ii. 18, 30, 40.

Panter, Patrick, Abbot of Cambuskenneth, i. 40.

Panter, Patrick, Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, iii. 46, 47, 57, 175.

Park, Sir James Allan, iv. 104, 106.

Pater Noster, the, alleged controversy regarding it, ii. 37, 38.

Paterson, John, Bishop of Ross, iii. 197, 254.

Paterson, John, Archbishop of Glasgow, is minister at Ellon, iii. 211. Is appointed a minister at Edinburgh, 211.

Is appointed to the see of Gal-loway, 248. Is translated to Edinburgh, 254. Is raised to the archbishopric of Glasgow, 285. Petitions the Prince of Orange for protection, 298. Consecrates Bishops Sage and Fullarton, 350. His death, 352.

Paterson, John, General Minister of the Grey Friars, ii. 34.

Paterson, Walter, one of Archbishop Leighton's preachers, iii. 237.

Paton, James, Bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 190.

Patrick, Abbot of Abernethy, i. 242.

Paul, Earl of Orkney, i. 247.

Pay, Stephen de, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 357.

Pecthelm, Bishop of Candida Casa, i. 121.

Pechtwin, Bishop of Candida Casa, i. 123.

Peebles, John, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 358.

Penance, discipline observed regarding it by Columba and his disciples, i. 148.

Penry, John, the English Puritan, ii. 249, 250.

Perth, Articles of, ii. 317-319.

Perth, Carthusian monastery at, its foundation, i. 364.

Perth, Councils of, i. 297, 308, 313, 329, 330, 343, 364, 365, 374.

Perth, monasteries of, their destruction at the Reformation, ii. 68.

Perth, James, Earl of, iii. 279, 283, 285.

- Peter, Bishop of Orkney, i. 337.
 Peter, Prior of Dunfermline, i. 210.
 Petrie, Arthur, Bishop of Murray, iv. 88-91, 93, 100, 101.
 Philip, Bishop of Brechin, i. 353.
 Picts, Northern, their conversion by St. Columba, i. 52-56.
 Picts, Southern, their conversion by St. Ninian, i. 15-18. Residence and labours of St. Palladius among them, 24, 25.
 Pilmore, John, Bishop of Murray. i. 347, 353.
 Pitcairn, Alexander, Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, iii. 232, 233.
 Pitsligo, Alexander, Lord Forbes of, iv. 44-46.
 Pluscardine, Monastery of, its foundation, i. 314.
 Pont, Robert, Bishop of Caithness, ii. 250, 251.
 Porterfield, John, Archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 190.
 Potton, Richard de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 335.
 Prebenda, Richard de, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 302.
 Prebenda, Robert de, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 335, 336.

Q.

- Quakers, account of them in the North of Scotland, iii. 268, 269.

R.

- Rae, William, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 352.
 Rait, James, Bishop of Brechin, iv. 12, 89.

- Rait, John, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 353.
 Ralph, Bishop of Brechin, i. 305.
 Ralph, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 320.
 Ralph, Bishop of Murray, i. 334.
 Ralph I., Bishop of Orkney, i. 251, 252.
 Ralph II., Bishop of Orkney, i. 251, 253, 254.
 Ramsay, Andrew, Minister at Edinburgh, iii. 70, 134, 141, 143.
 Ramsay, James, Bishop of Ross, is Dean of Glasgow, iii. 232. Attends Archbishop Leighton at his conference with the Presbyterian ministers, 239. Is appointed to the see of Dunblane, 244. Attempts to procure the meeting of a National Synod, 249. Vindicates his proceedings to Archbishop Sharp, 250, 251. Is suspended, 251. His angry correspondence with the archbishop, 251. Is restored, 252. Is appointed Bishop of Ross, 277. His death, 312.
 Ramsay, Peter de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 318, 334.
 Ranken, David, one of the College Bishops, iii. 399; iv. 6.
 Rattray, Thomas, Bishop of Dunkeld, his remarks on the circular of the College Bishops, iii. 391, 392. His opinion regarding the usages, 392. Remonstrates against the election of Bishop Norrie, 396, 397. Is appointed Bishop of Brechin, 399. His election declared void by the Col-

- lege Bishops, iv. 5. Is appointed Bishop of Dunkeld, 7. Is appointed Primus, 10. His death and character, 13.
- Raylston, John, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 379.
- Reginald, King of the Isles, i. 288.
- Reginald, Bishop of Man, i. 322, 323.
- Reginald, Bishop of Ross, i. 304, 318.
- Reid, Robert, Bishop of Orkney, his appointment to the bishopric, ii. 18. Attends the Provincial Council of 1549, 34. Makes a new erection of the Chapter of Orkney, 41. His death, 41, 42.
- Relief Presbytery, its formation, iv. 79. Takes the name of the Relief Synod, 79. Its union with the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, 235-239.
- Renwick, James, a Presbyterian preacher, his birth and education, iii. 288. His residence in Holland, 288. His ordination, 288. His return to Scotland, 289. His examination before the Privy Council, 289, 291. His trial, 290. His death, 290.
- Resby, James, a disciple of Wicliffe, i. 365. His opinions, 365. His death, 366.
- Richard I., Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 289, 301.
- Richard II., Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 352.
- Richard, Bishop of Man, i. 336 ; iv. 285.
- Richard, Bishop of Murray, i. 296, 303.
- Richard, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 287, 289, 292.
- Richardson, Robert, Canon of Cambuskenneth, ii. 12, 13.
- Robert I., King of the Scots, his accession, i. 339. Maintains the independence of Scotland, 340. Concludes the Treaty of Northampton, 340. Obtains from the Pope a Bull for the unction of the Scottish kings, 341. His death and character, 341.
- Robert II., King of the Scots, i. 353.
- Robert III., King of the Scots, i. 355, 356.
- Robert, Bishop of Caithness, i. 369.
- Robert, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 374, 381.
- Robert, Bishop of the Isles, i. 392.
- Robert I., Bishop of Ross, i. 304, 318, 335.
- Robert II., Bishop of Ross, i. 335.
- Robert III., Bishop of Ross, i. 335, 347.
- Robert, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 217, 262, 263, 287.
- Robertson, William, Principal of the College of Edinburgh, his birth and education, iv. 137. Is appointed Principal of the College of Edinburgh, 137. His writings, 137, 138. Is the leader of the Moderate party, 138. Is favourable to a repeal of the penal laws against

- Roman Catholics, 141, 142.
 Ceases to attend the General Assembly, 143. His death, 143. His ecclesiastical influence, 144, 145.
- Robhartach I., Abbot of Iona, i. 186.
- Robhartach II., Abbot of Iona, i. 187.
- Roderick the Bountiful, King of Cumbria, i. 38, 39.
- Roger, Bishop of Orkney, i. 251, 253.
- Roger, Bishop of Ross, i. 353.
- Roger, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 295, 296.
- Roland, Lord of Galloway, i. 298.
- Rollock, Peter, Bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 250, 290.
- Rollock, Robert, Principal of the College of Edinburgh, ii. 274.
- Ronald, Bishop of Man, i. 270.
- Ronald, Earl of Orkney, i. 251.
- Ronan, Abbot of Lochleven, i. 175.
- Roolwer, Bishop of Man, i. 255.
- Rose, Alexander, Bishop of Edinburgh, his appointment to the see of Murray, iii. 284. His translation to Edinburgh, 285. Goes to London as commissioner from the Scottish bishops, 291, 292. Visits Archbishop Sancroft and Bishop Lloyd, 295, 296. His application to Dr. Burnet and Bishop Compton, 296. His conversation with Bishop Compton, 296, 297. His interview with the Prince of Orange, 297, 298. Refuses to abandon King James, 299.
- Consecrates Bishops Sage and and Fullarton, 350. Character of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 351, 352. Consecrates Bishops Falconer and Christie, 355, 356. His opinion as to Presbyterian baptism, 369. His death, 381. His letter regarding the usages, 389.
- Rose, Charles, Bishop of Dunkeld, iv. 88, 89, 91, 99.
- Rose, James, one of the College Bishops, iii. 396 ; iv. 7, 8.
- Rosemarkie, Church of, i. 266.
- Ross, Bishopric of, its foundation, i. 266.
- Ross, Chapter of, i. 277.
- Ross, Synod of, its meeting in 1661, iii. 180, 181.
- Ross, Alexander, Minister at Aberdeen, ii. 372 ; iii. 64.
- Ross, Arthur, Archbishop of St. Andrews, is Parson of Glasgow, iii. 232. Is appointed Bishop of Argyll, 249. Is translated to Galloway, 259. Is appointed Archbishop of Glasgow, 259. Is appointed Archbishop of St. Andrews, 278. Refuses to abandon King James, 299. His death, 311.
- Roths, John, Earl of, ii. 392 ; iii. 2, 34, 83, 84.
- Rough, John, a Dominican friar, ii. 20, 29, 32, 33.
- Roxburgh, Council of, i. 261.
- Roxburgh, Hugh de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 300.
- Row, John, Minister at Perth, his residence in Italy, ii. 80. Narrative of his conversion from Popery, 80-82. Examination

- of its correctness, 82, 83. As-
sists in compiling the Con-
fession of Faith, 91.
- Row, John, Principal of King's
College, Aberdeen, iii. 163.
- Rule, St., Church of, i. 9.
- Rule, St., legend of, i. 9.
- Rushin Abbey, its foundation, i.
272.
- Russel, William, Bishop of Man,
i. 354, 360 ; iv. 286.
- Russell, Jerome, a Franciscan
friar, his death, ii. 10, 11.
- Russell, Michael, Bishop of Glas-
gow, iv. 190, 251.
- Rutherford, Samuel, Principal of
St. Mary's College, St. Andrews,
is appointed minister at An-
woth, ii. 369. Is summoned
before the High Commission,
369. Is ordered to reside at
Aberdeen, 369. His discussions
with the divines of that city,
370. Returns to Anwoth, iii.
6. Is a member of the Glas-
gow Assembly, 34. Is ap-
pointed Principal of St. Mary's
College, 63. Protests against
the lawfulness of the General
Assembly of 1651, 155. His
death, 177.
- S.
- Sage, John, one of the College
Bishops, his birth and educa-
tion, iii. 348, 349. His ordina-
tion, 349. His writings, 349.
Is summoned before the Privy
Council, 349. His consecration,
350, 351. His death, 356.
- St. Andrews, Archbishopric of,
its erection, i. 376-378.
- St. Andrews, Archdeaconries of,
i. 277.
- St. Andrews, Chapter of, i. 277 ;
ii. 290, 309.
- St. Andrews, Church of, its
foundation, i. 132. Becomes
the seat of the Primacy, i. 166-
168.
- St. Andrews, Culdee monastery
at, i. 241.
- St. Andrews, Diocesan Synod of,
its meeting in 1662, iii. 201,
202.
- St. Andrews, Monastery of Canons-
Regular at, its foundation, i.
263.
- St. Andrews, Monasteries of, their
destruction at the Reformation,
ii. 70.
- St. Andrews, Rural Deaneries of,
i. 277.
- St. Andrews, University of, its
foundation, i. 367, 368. Its
visitation in 1690, iii. 318.
- St. Clair, William de, Bishop of
Dunkeld, i. 346, 352.
- Samson, Bishop of Brechin, i.
268 ; iv. 283.
- Sandale, Abbey of, its foundation,
i. 288.
- Sandford, Daniel, Bishop of Edin-
burgh, iv. 135, 136, 245, 246,
280.
- Scone, Abbey of, its foundation,
i. 217. Connection between
it and the diocese of Caithness,
319.
- Scone, Councils of, i. 167, 168,
172, 173, 343.
- Scoonie, Church of, given to the
monastery of Lochleven, i. 188.
- Scots College at Paris, i. 347.

- Scougal, Henry, Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen, his birth and education, iii. 269, 270. Is appointed Professor of Divinity at King's College, 270. His death, 270. His character and writings, 270.
- Scougal, Patrick, Bishop of Aberdeen, his appointment to the see of Aberdeen, iii. 215. Objects to the Test, 266. Receives it with an explanation, 267. His ecclesiastical government, 269. His death, 275.
- Scroggie, Alexander, Minister at Old Aberdeen, ii. 372 ; iii. 53, 73, 77, 78.
- Scroggie, William, Bishop of Argyll, iii. 226, 248.
- Seabury, Samuel, Bishop of Connecticut, his arrival in England, iv. 92. Applies for consecration to the Scottish bishops, 92, 93. Comes to Scotland, 93. His consecration, 93. Articles of agreement between him and the Scottish bishops, 93-95. His return to America, 95. Address presented to him by his clergy, 95-98. His reply, 98.
- Seaton, Alexander, a Dominican friar, ii. 13, 14.
- Secker, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, his speech on the bill imposing penalties on the Episcopal clergy, iv. 38-40.
- Segenius, Abbot of Iona, i. 71, 72, 74, 76, 83.
- Selkirk, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 219. Is transferred to Kelso, 274.
- Serf, St., account of, i. 28, 29.
- Sexhelm, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183.
- Sharp, James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, is minister at Crail, iii. 157. Is seized by the English, 157. Is released, 158. Goes to London in 1656, on behalf of the Resolutioners, 163. Goes to London in 1660, on behalf of the Resolutioners, 169. His correspondence with Douglas, 169-172. Is appointed Archbishop of St. Andrews, 188. Account of his early life, 188. Examination of the charge of treachery brought against him, 189-192. His consecration, 196. Holds his diocesan synod, 201, 202. Attempt on his life by James Mitchell, 231. His sermon on the ecclesiastical supremacy, 233. Is opposed to the calling of a National Synod, 249. His angry correspondence with Bishop Ramsay, 251. His conduct at Mitchell's trial, 255. His death, 257, 258. His character, 258.
- Shaw, Robert, Bishop of Murray, ii. 4.
- Sheves, William, Archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 385-387, 394.
- Shoreswood, George, Bishop of Brechin, i. 381.
- Sibbald, James, Minister at Aberdeen, his appointment as one of the ministers of St. Nicholas Church, Aberdeen, ii. 372.

- Retires to England, iii. 56.
 Charges against him at the
 Aberdeen Assembly, 73, 74.
 Is deposed, 74. Receives a
 benefice at Dublin, 78. Sup-
 ports the Book of Common
 Prayer, 78, 79. His death, 79.
- Sigillo, Hugh de, Bishop of Dun-
 keld, i. 302, 317.
- Sigurd the Stout, Earl of Ork-
 ney, i. 246, 247.
- Simeon, Bishop of Ross, i. 266,
 304.
- Simon, Bishop of Dunblane, i.
 305.
- Simon, Bishop of Galloway, i.
 354.
- Simon, Bishop of Man, i. 336,
 337.
- Simon, Bishop of Murray, i. 317,
 334.
- Simson, Duncan, his death, ii. 10.
- Simson, John, Professor of Di-
 vinity at Glasgow, iv. 51, 52.
- Sinclair, Henry, Bishop of Ross,
 i. 40, 137, 145, 146.
- Sinclair, John, Bishop of Brechin,
 attends Adam Wallace at his
 death, ii. 35. Celebrates Queen
 Mary's marriage with Darnley,
 141. Is appointed to the see
 of Brechin, 146. His death,
 151.
- Skinner, John, Clergyman at
 Longside, iv. 37, 42.
- Skinner, John, Bishop of Aber-
 deen, his consecration, iv. 90,
 91. Assists in consecrating
 Bishop Seabury, 93. Is ap-
 pointed Bishop of Aberdeen,
 99. Is appointed Primus, 99.
 Endeavours to obtain a repeal
 of the penal laws, 102, 103.
 Goes to London, 103. Meets
 Archbishop Moore at Lambeth,
 103. His letter to Bishop
 Warren, 104-106. His return
 to Scotland, 106. Meets the
 bishops, clergy, and laity at
 Laurencekirk, 106. Again pro-
 ceeds to London, 107. Suc-
 ceeds in obtaining a repeal of
 the penal laws, 108, 109. At-
 tends a second meeting of the
 bishops, clergy, and laity at Lau-
 rence Kirk, 110, 111. Summons
 a convocation of the bishops
 and clergy at Laurence Kirk, 115.
 Offers articles of union to the
 clergy of English ordination,
 122-124. Presides at the Sy-
 nod of Aberdeen, 128. His
 death and character, 135.
- Skinner, John, Dean of Dunkeld,
 his letter on the admission of
 the laity to a share in the go-
 vernment of the Church, iv.
 176-178. Is Prolocutor of the
 lower chamber at the Synod of
 Laurence Kirk, 182.
- Skinner, William, Bishop of Aber-
 deen, iv. 135, 136, 245, 246,
 280.
- Sleben, Abbot of Iona, i. 122.
- Soltra, Hospital of, its founda-
 tion, i. 288.
- Soulseat, Abbey of, its founda-
 tion, i. 269, 273.
- Spence, Thomas, Bishop of Aber-
 deen, i. 374, 380, 381, 390, 391.
- Spottiswood, John, Superinten-
 dent of Lothian, ii. 83, 91,
 180.
- Spottiswood, John, Archbishop of

- St. Andrews, is appointed to the see of Glasgow, ii. 283. His consecration, 296, 297. Examines Ogilvie the Jesuit, 301, 302. Is translated to St. Andrews, 303. His sermon at the Perth Assembly, 314-316. Crowns King Charles, 344. Is appointed Chancellor, 353. His letter to Dr. John Forbes, 357. Restores the Church of Dairsie, 362. His letter to Bishop Wren, 378, 379. His conversation with the Earl of Rothes, 392. Designs of the Covenanters against him, iii. 21. Resigns the Chancellorship, 22. Is deposed and excommunicated by the Glasgow Assembly, 42, 44. His last will, 65, 66. His address to the Marquis of Hamilton, 66. His death, 66. His writings, 67. His character, 67, 68.
- Spottiswood, Sir Robert, President of the Court of Session, iii. 86, 114-116.
- Spynie, William de, Bishop of Murray, i. 359, 368.
- Stephen, Bishop of Brechin, i. 359.
- Stephen, Bishop of Man, i. 336, 337.
- Stephen, William, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 364, 369.
- Stevens, William, Treasurer of Queen Anne's Bounty, iv. 106, 113.
- Stewart, Alexander, Archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 395, 396.
- Stewart, Alexander, Bishop of Murray, ii. 4.
- Stewart, Allan, Commendator of Crossraguel, ii. 167.
- Stewart, Andrew, I., Bishop of Caithness, i. 391, 410.
- Stewart, Andrew, II., Bishop of Caithness, i. 410 ; ii. 6, 18.
- Stewart, Andrew, Bishop of Murray, i. 390, 402.
- Stewart, David, Bishop of Murray, i. 380.
- Stewart, Edward, Bishop of Orkney, i. 310.
- Stewart, James, Duke of Ross, and Archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 394, 395.
- Stewart, James, Bishop of Murray, i. 380.
- Stewart, Robert, Bishop of Caithness, ii. 18, 180, 184, 192, 250.
- Stewart, Thomas, Archdeacon of St. Andrews, i. 357.
- Stewart, William, Bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 5, 6, 17.
- Stirling, Chapel Royal at, its erection, i. 393.
- Stirling, Gilbert de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 317.
- Strachan, David, Bishop of Brechin, iii. 197, 242.
- Strachan, John, Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, iii. 300, 304, 320.
- Strachan, John, Bishop of Brechin, iv. 101, 103, 125.
- Stratherne, Gilbert, Earl of, i. 298, 305, 306.
- Straton, David, his death, ii. 10.
- Stuteville, Robert de, Bishop of Dunkeld, i. 334.
- Suibne I., Abbot of Iona, i. 83.
- Suibne II., Abbot of Iona, i. 122.
- Sydserf, Thomas, Bishop of

Orkney, his appointment to the see of Brechin, ii. 353. His translation to Galloway, 353. Is attacked by the rabble at Edinburgh, 404. Is deposed and excommunicated by the Glasgow Assembly, iii. 42-44. His residence at Paris, 110. His character as described by Robert Burnet of Crimond, 111. Ordains Durell and Brevint in the chapel of the English ambassador at Paris, 167. His ordinations in England after the Restoration, 188. Is appointed to the see of Orkney, 188. His death, 214, 215.

T.

Tain, Collegiate Church of, its foundation, i. 391.

Temple, The, in Mid-Lothian, i. 276.

Ternan, St., account of, i. 29, 30.

Terrot, Charles Hughes, Bishop of Edinburgh, iv. 245.

Thomas I., Bishop of Galloway, i. 354.

Thomas II., Bishop of Galloway, i. 360, 370.

Thomas, Bishop of Man, i. 354.

Thomas I., Bishop of Ross, i. 380.

Thomas II., Bishop of Ross, i. 391.

Thomson, Andrew, Minister at Edinburgh, is one of the leaders of the Popular party, iv. 153. Commences the publication of the Edinburgh Christian Instructor, 153. His motion in

the General Assembly regarding prayers for the Royal Family, 158. His death, 203. Thorfin, Earl of Orkney, i. 247.

Thorulf, Bishop of Orkney, i. 253.

Tilred, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183.

Tonei, Simon de, Bishop of Murray, i. 303.

Tonsure, the, dispute regarding it, i. 88, 93.

Torphichen, the seat of the knights of St. John, i. 276.

Torry, Patrick, Bishop of St. Andrews, iv. 124, 125, 250, 256, 266-270, 279.

Trail, Walter, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 357.

Trower, Walter John, Bishop of Glasgow, iv. 251, 257-259.

Trumhere, Bishop of the Mercians, i. 85.

Trumwine, Bishop of Abercorn, i. 103, 104, 106.

Tuathal, Abbot of Dunkeld, i. 162, 165.

Tuathal, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 188.

Tuathalan, Abbot of St. Andrews, i. 132.

Tuda, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 94, 99.

Tulchan Bishops, ii. 226, 227.

Tulloch, Thomas de, Bishop of Orkney, i. 371, 381, 382.

Tulloch, William de, Bishop of Murray, i. 382, 390, 392.

Tunbert, Bishop of Hexham, i. 103, 104.

Tungland, Abbey of, its foundation, i. 273.

Turgot, Bishop of St. Andrews, his Life of St. Margaret, i. 189, 190. His appointment to the see of St. Andrews, 207. Account of his early life, 207, 208. His disputes with King Alexander, 208. His death, 209. His writings, 209.

Turnbull, William, Bishop of Glasgow, is translated from Dunkeld to Glasgow, i. 378. Founds the University of Glasgow, 378, 379. His death, 379.

Turner, Sir James, iii. 228.

Turpin, Bishop of Brechin, i. 305.

Tynningham, Monastery of, i. 108.

Tynningham, Adam de, Bishop of Aberdeen, i. 359.

Tyrie, James, a Jesuit priest, ii. 182, 209.

U.

Uchtred, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183.

Uchtred, Lord of Galloway, i. 288.

United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, its formation, iv. 167, 168. Its union with the Relief Synod, 235-239.

United Presbyterian Church, its formation, iv. 239.

Urquhart, Priory of, its foundation, i. 274.

Usages, the, controversy regarding them, iii. 387-395.

V.

Vaus, George, Bishop of Galloway, i. 392, 411.

Victor I., Pope, legend of the conversion of the Scots in his time, i. 3-5.

Virgnous, Abbot of Iona, i. 70, 71.

Voluntary Church Controversy, account of, iv. 200, 201.

W.

Waldby, Robert, Bishop of Man, i. 360.

Walker, James, Bishop of Edinburgh, is Dean of Edinburgh, iv. 129. Is Prolocutor of the lower chamber of the Synod of Aberdeen, 129. His orthodoxy is denied by Edward Craig, 180. He is vindicated by the bishops and clergy, 181. Is appointed Bishop of Edinburgh, 187. Is appointed Primus, 189. Presides at the Synod of Edinburgh, 192. His death, 245.

Wallace, Adam, his death, ii. 35.

Wallace, Robert, Bishop of the Isles, iii. 197, 198, 242.

Walter, Bishop of Dunblane, i. 353, 359.

Walter, Bishop of Galloway, i. 306, 322.

Walter, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 297, 301, 308, 317.

Walter, son of Alan, Steward of Scotland, i. 288.

Waltheof, St., Abbot of Melrose, i. 276, 279-281.

Wardlaw, Cardinal Walter de, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 352, 358.

Wardlaw, Henry, Bishop of St

- Andrews, is appointed to the see of St. Andrews, i. 357. Is entrusted with the education of Prince James, 358. Persecutes the Lollards, 367. Founds the University of St. Andrews, 367, 368. His death, 374.
- Wardlaw, Ralph, Minister at Glasgow, iv. 170, 201.
- Watson, Jonathan, Bishop of Dunkeld, iv. 111, 116, 124.
- Wedderburn, James, Bishop of Dunblane, ii. 358, 377 ; iii. 42, 45, 65.
- Welsh, David, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Edinburgh, iv. 221, 227, 232.
- Welsh, John, Minister at Ayr, is committed to prison, ii. 284. His banishment, 289. His death, 329. Interview of his wife with King James, 329.
- Wesley, John, his visits to Scotland, iv. 72, 73.
- Westminster Assembly of Divines, iii. 98-100.
- Whitby, Council of, i. 89-93.
- White, Robert, Bishop of Dunblane, iv. 9, 10, 20, 47, 87.
- Whitefield, George, comes to Scotland, iv. 68. His conference with the Associate Presbytery, 68, 69. His quarrel with them, 69, 70. Preaches at Cambuslang, 70, 71.
- Whitford, Walter, Bishop of Brechin, ii. 353 ; iii. 32, 42, 44, 88.
- Whithorn, see Candida Casa.
- Wigred, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 183.
- Wilfrid, Bishop of York, is educated at the monastery of Lindisfarne, i. 89. Visits Rome, 89. Returns to England, 90. Attends the Council of Whitby, 90. Defends the Roman usages, 90-93. Is appointed Bishop of York, 99. His consecration, 100. His ecclesiastical reforms, 101, 102. His quarrel with King Egfrid, 102. Is deprived of his see, 102. Attends a council at Rome, 108. Is appointed Bishop of Hexham, 108. Administers the diocese of Lindisfarne, 109. His death, 113.
- William, King of the Scots, his accession, i. 289. Invades England and is made prisoner, 289. His treaty with King Henry, 289, 290. His ecclesiastical policy, 291. Founds the abbey of Arbroath, 292. His dispute with John the Scot, Bishop of St. Andrews, 292-295. His death, 297.
- William III., King of Great Britain, his interview with Bishop Rose, iii. 297, 298. Accepts the crown of Scotland, 300. His desire for a measure of ecclesiastical comprehension in Scotland, 328-330. His death, 340.
- William I., Bishop of Argyll, i. 322.
- William II., Bishop of Argyll, ii. 31.
- William I., Bishop of Brechin, i. 335.
- William II., Bishop of Brechin, i. 335, 348.
- William I., Bishop of Caithness, i. 320, 335.

William II., Bishop of Caithness,
i. 369, 380, 391.

William I., Bishop of Dunblane,
i. 336, 348.

William II., Bishop of Dunblane,
i. 353.

William, Bishop of Man, i. 255.

William, Bishop of Murray, i.
266, 287, 302.

William I., Bishop of Orkney, i.
253, 270, 307.

William II., Bishop of Orkney, i.
307.

William III., Bishop of Orkney,
i. 349, 355.

William IV., Bishop of Orkney, i.
355, 361.

Willock, John, Superintendent of
Glasgow, ii. 42, 45, 48, 53, 64,
70, 73, 76, 83, 91, 101,
114.

Wilson, Margaret, her death, iii.
281, 282.

Wilson, William, Minister at
Perth, iv. 58.

Wimund, Bishop of Man, i. 270,
271.

Winchester, John, Bishop of Mur-
ray, i. 368, 369, 380.

Winram, John, Sub-prior of St.
Andrews, secretly favours the
Reformed opinions, ii. 12.
Preaches at Wishart's trial, 24.
Receives Wishart's confession
25. His conference with
Knox, 33. Attends the Pro-
vincial Council of 1549, 34.
Joins the Protestants, 77. Is
appointed Superintendent of
Fife, 83. Assists in compiling
the Confession of Faith, 91.
Is appointed a commissioner

to arrange the ecclesiastical
polity, 176. His death, 229.

Winzet, Ninian, Schoolmaster at
Linlithgow, his birth and edu-
cation, ii. 115. His disputes
with the Protestant ministers,
115. His Tractate in defence
of the Roman Catholic Church,
115-117. His Treatise con-
taining eighty-three questions
to Knox, 117-119. His letter
to Knox, 119-121. His Trea-
tise regarding the observance
of Easter, 121. His Last
Blast of the Trumpet against
the usurped authority of the
Reformers, 121. Is obliged to
leave Scotland, 122. His other
writings, 122. His death, 122.

Wishart, George, a Protestant
minister, obscurity of his early
life, ii. 22. His residence in
England, 22. Esteem in which
he was held at Cambridge, 22.
His return to Scotland, 23.
Results of his preaching the
Reformed doctrines, 23. Is
seized and imprisoned by Car-
dinal Beaton, 23. His trial
and condemnation, 23, 24.
His death, 25, 26. His al-
leged connection with the
conspiracy against Cardinal
Beaton, 26.

Wishart, George, Bishop of Edin-
burgh, is minister at St. An-
drews, iii. 47. Proceedings
against him at the Glasgow
Assembly, 47. Is deposed, 57.
Is one of the clergy at New-
castle, 115. Is imprisoned by
the Covenanters, 113. Is

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>released by the Marquis of Montrose, 113. Becomes chaplain to the Marquis, 113. Is appointed Bishop of Edinburgh, 197. Holds his diocesan synod, 202. His kindness to the Covenanters in prison, 238. His death, 242.</p> <p>Wishart, Robert, Bishop of Glasgow, i. 334, 345.</p> <p>Wishart, William, Bishop of St. Andrews, i. 332, 333.</p> | <p>Wood, Andrew, Bishop of Caithness, iii. 254, 259, 312.</p> <p>Wordsworth, Charles, Bishop of St. Andrews, iv. 245, 256, 277, 280.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Y.</p> <p>Young, Alexander, Bishop of Edinburgh, iii. 242, 249, 250, 254, 276, 277.</p> <p>Young, John, Professor of Divinity at Glasgow, iii. 226.</p> |
|---|---|

THE END.

NAMES OF SUBSCRIBERS.

						No. of Copies.	
						Fine.	Common.
Rev. C. J. Abbey, Trinity College, Glenalmond,							1
The Dowager Lady Abercromby,				1	
Right Rev. The Bishop of Aberdeen,				1	
Venerable Archdeacon Aitchison,					1
Rev. George Akers, Malling Abbey,					1
Rev. Dr. John Alexander, St. Columba's Church,							
Edinburgh,		1
Captain A. Stewart Allan, Cawnpore,				1	
Alexander Anderson, Advocate, Aberdeen,	...					1	
George Anderson, Solicitor, Inverness,	...						1
Right Rev. The Bishop of Argyll and the Isles,						1	
Patrick Arkley of Dunninald, Sheriff Substitute of							
Mid-Lothian,			1
Rev. H. G. W. Aubrey, St. Peter's Church, Gala-							
shiels,	1	
Rev. James S. Baird, Pitlochrie,					1
The Lady Blanche Balfour,			1	
John Barron, Advocate, Aberdeen,				1	
Rev. Walter Bell, St. Mungo's Church, West							
Linton,		1
Alexander J. B. Beresford-Hope,				1	
T. G. Beveridge, Ferryhill, Aberdeen,					1
Rev. E. L. Blenkinsopp, Bridge of Allan,	...						1
G. B. Bothwell, Bonaccord Square, Aberdeen,							1
Hon. George Frederick Boyle,			1	
Charles Brand, Montrose,			1	
William Brand, W.S., Union Bank of Scotland,							1

		No. of Copies.	
		Fine.	Common.
Right Rev. The Bishop of Brechin,	1		
Thomas J. Bremner, Advocate, Peterhead, ...	1		
Rev. William Bright, Fellow of University College, Oxford,	1		
A. Brown and Co., Booksellers, Aberdeen, ...		2	
Robert Brown, St. Mary Hall, Oxford, ...	1		
Dr. W. A. F. Browne, one of the Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland,	1		
Dr. William Bruce, Edinburgh,	1		
Rev. W. B. Bryan, Rodington Rectory, ...	1		
Newell Burnett, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1		
John Hill Burton, Advocate, Edinburgh, ...	1		
Rev. W. B. Bushby, St. Mary's Church, Dalkeith, ...	1		
Mrs. Cameron, Lakefield, Glen Urquhart, ...		2	
Very Rev. Dr. P. C. Campbell, Principal of the University of Aberdeen,	1		
Rev. James H. Carr, St. John's Church, Edinburgh, ...	1		
Rev. J. G. Cazenove, Vice-Provost of the College, Isle of Cumbrae,	1		
John Inglis Chalmers of Aldbar,	1		
Robert Chambers, London,		1	
Rev. Patrick Cheyne, Aberdeen,	1		
Alexander Chivas, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1		
J. H. Christie, Lincoln's Inn, London,	1		
Dr. John Christie, Aberdeen,	1		
John D. Christie, Nether Auchintoul, Alford, ...		1	
T. C. Christie of Bedlay,	1		
Alexander Clark, College Bounds, Old Aberdeen, ...	1		
Dr. Clark of Princeland, Coupar Angus,	1		
John Clark, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1		
Norval Clyne, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1		
George Collic, Advocate, Aberdeen,		1	
James Collic, Advocate, Aberdeen,		1	
Rev. John Comper, St. John's Church, Aberdeen, ...		1	
Arthur Coombs, Oriel College, Oxford,	1		
Patrick Cooper, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1		
Rev. William Cowie, Manse, Cairney,	1		
James T. Gibson Craig, W.S., Edinburgh,	1		1

				No. of Copies.
				Fine. Common.
Miss Cumine of Rattray,	1
Miss Cumming of Altyre,	1
Mrs. Dalgairns, Broomland House, Dumfries,				1
Alexander Daniel, Cruden,	1
Charles Elphinstone Dalrymple,	1
Rev. Dr. Alexander Davidson, Free West Church,				
Aberdeen,	1
Rev. James Davidson, Parsonage, Meldrum,	...			1
F. H. Dickenson, Upper Harley Street, London,				1
M. E. Grant Duff of Eden, M.P.,	1
James Duguid, Rothie,	1
William Pitt Dundas, Deputy Clerk Register of				
Scotland,	1
William Dunn, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1
John Edmond, Bookbinder, Aberdeen,	...			1
Sir Archibald Edmonstone, Bart.,	1
Edmonston & Douglas, Booksellers, Edinburgh,				1
Rev. V. G. Faithfull, Trinity Church, Edinburgh,				1
Henry Farnie, Edinburgh,	1
Rev. William Farquhar, Pitscandly House,	...			1
Dr. George Ferguson, Professor of Humanity, Aber-				
deen,	1
John Ferme, Banker, Haddington,	1
M. Finch, Oriel College, Oxford,	1
John Fleming, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1
Alexander Flockhart, Advocate, Aberdeen,	...			1
The Lord Forbes,	1
The Master of Forbes,	1
Alexander Forbes of Boyndlie,	1
George R. Forbes, Sheriff Clerk of Banffshire,				1
James Forbes, Merchant, Aberdeen,	1
William Forbes of Medwyn,	1
Very Rev. E. B. K. Fortescue, Provost of St.				
Ninian's, Perth,	1
William Fraser, Assistant Keeper of the General				
Register of Sasines,	1

	No. of Copies.	
	Fine.	Common.
Rev. James Gammack, Tillymorgan,		1
William D. Geddes, Professor of Greek, Aberdeen,		1
William Sidney Gibson, Barrister-at-Law, Tyne- mouth,		1
Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer,	1	
Right Rev. The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway,	1	
Alexander Gordon of Newton,	1	
Lient.-Col. Bertie Gordon, H. M. 91st Regiment,	1	
G. J. R. Gordon, younger of Ellon, H. M. Pleni- potentiary at Stuttgart,	1	
Dr. James Gordon, Old Aberdeen,		1
Rev. Dr. J. F. S. Gordon, St. Andrew's Church, Glasgow,		1
Very Rev. J. Green, Dean of Natal,		1
Rev. W. T. Greive, Wantage,	1	
Rev. Nathaniel Grieve, Parsonage, Ellon, ...		1
A. S. Haddan, St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, ...		1
Rev. Alexander Harper, Parsonage, Inverury,		1
Very Rev. Alexander Henderson, Dean of Glasgow,		1
The Lord Herries,	1	
David Home, Woolmet, Dalkeith,	1	
Rev. Thomas Archer Houblon, Peasemore Rectory,		1
Rev. Henry Humble, Precentor of St. Ninian's, Perth,	1	
William Humphrey, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...		1
Rev. J. W. Hunter, Lochee Mission, Dundee,		1
William Hunter, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1	
John Hutchison of Ashmore,		1
William Hutchison of Cairngall,	1	
Cosmo Innes, Professor of History, Edinburgh,	1	
Dr. F. W. Innes, C.B., Deputy Inspector-General of Hospitals,	1	1
Mrs. Innes, Inverury,	1	
Rev. George Ironside, Parsonage, Muchalls, ...		1
Alexander Forbes Irvine, younger of Drum, ...	1	
Dr. John Irvine, Tarves,		1

	No. of Copies.	
	Fine.	Common.
George A. Jamieson, Accountant, Edinburgh,	1	
James R. Jamieson, W.S., Edinburgh, ...	1	
Dr. Robert Jamieson, Elmhill, Aberdeen, ...	1	
Rev. Canon Jenkins, Jesus College, Oxford, ...		1
Rev. T. H. Jones, Edinburgh, ...	1	
Alexander Jopp, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1	
Right Hon. The Lord Justice-Clerk, ...	1	
Christopher Kerr, Arthurston, ...	1	
C. Webster Kerr, Auchterhouse, Dundee, ...		1
William Kerr, Writer, Dundee, ...		1
Arthur King, Printer, Aberdeen, ..	6	
Rev. Frederick George Lee, St. Mary's Church, Aberdeen, ...	1	
Rev. Alexander Lendrum, St. Margaret's College, Crieff, ...	1	
Rev. Alexander Leslie, Parsonage, Meiklefolia,		1
John Grant Leslie, Sheriff Clerk-Depute of Aber- deenshire, ...	1	
Rev. Henry P. Liddon, Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, ...		1
John Ligertwood, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1	
Mrs. Ligertwood, ...	1	
The Lord Lindsay, ...	1	
Mrs. Loch, Edinburgh, ...	1	
Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of London, ...	1	
Rev. Alexander Low, Parsonage, Longside, ...		1
Alexander Lyell, Customs, Aberdeen, ...	1	
John S. Lyell, Merchant, London, ...	1	
John Lyell, Union Terrace, Aberdeen, ...	1	
Library of the Society of Advocates, Aberdeen,	1	1
Library of the Diocese of Aberdeen, ...	1	
Library of St. Andrew's Church, Aberdeen, ...		1
Library of the University of Aberdeen, ...		1
Library of the Diocese of Brechin, ...	1	
Library of the College, Isle of Cumbræ, ...	1	
Library of Muchalls Church, ...		1
Library of St. John's Church, New Pitsligo, ...		1

	No. of Copies.
	Fine. Common.
Library of Magdalen College, Oxford, ...	1
Library of University College, Oxford, ...	1
Library of the Cathedral of St. Ninian's, Perth,	1
Library of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,	1
Rev. Malcolm M'Coll, St. Barnabas College, London,	1
Rev. Dr. Charles M'Combie, Manse, Lumphanan,	1
James B. M'Combie, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1
William M'Combie of Easter Skene, ...	1
Rev. J. F. Macdonald, Christ Church, Huntly,	1
Lachlan M'Kinnon, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1
Rev. J. C. Macphail, Free East Church, Aberdeen,	1
Hon. Mrs. Maule, Maulesden,	1
Hon. Marmaduke C. Maxwell, Terregles, ...	1
George Melvin, Schoolhouse, Tarves, ...	1
John Michell of Glassel,	1
David Middleton, one of H. M. Inspectors of Schools, Aberdeen,	1
Alexander Milne, Errol Schools, Cruden, ...	1
George Milne, Commission Agent, Aberdeen, ...	1
John Duguid Milne, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1
David Mitchell, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1
John M. Mitchell, Belgian Consul, Leith, ...	1
Very Rev. John Moir, Dean of Brechin, ...	1
Rev. W. Y. Moir, Parsonage, Strichen, ...	1
Right Rev. The Bishop of Moray and Ross, ...	1
David R. Morice, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1
J. C. Morison, Mornington Road, London, ...	1
William Murdoch, Solicitor, Huntly, ...	1
Hon. Lord Neaves,	1
Alexander Nicol, Merchant, Aberdeen, ...	1
Rev. James Nicolson, St. Salvador's Church, Dundee,	1
William F. Ogg, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1
Dr. George Ogilvie, Professor of the Institutes of Medicine, Aberdeen,	1
Hon. William Ogilvie of Loyal,	1
Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Oxford, ...	1

	No. of Copies.	
	Fine.	Common.
Francis Pirie, Rickarton House, Stonehaven, ...	1	
Rev. H. G. Pirie, Parsonage, Dunoon, ...		1
Rev. J. B. Pratt, Parsonage, Cruden, ...		1
Rev. Charles Pressley, Parsonage, Fraserburgh, ...		1
Rev. W. H. B. Proby, Parsonage, Muchalls, ...		1
D. C. Rait, Newton Place, Glasgow, ...	1	
Very Rev. E. B. Ramsay, Dean of Edinburgh, ...	1	
Sir George Ramsay of Bamff, Bart., ...	1	
John Ramsay of Barra, ...	1	
Rev. Dr. William Reeves, Vicar of Lusk, ...	1	
John Reid, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1	
William L. Reid, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1	
A. H. Rhind, Down House, Redland, Bristol, ...	1	
Rev. Charles Robertson, Tummel Bridge, ...		1
John Robertson, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1	
Joseph Robertson, Register House, Edinburgh, ...	1	
Rev. Mr. Robertson, Mission, Natal, ...		1
The Lord Rollo, ...	1	
James Ronalds, Murray Street, Montrose, ...	1	
Rev. Gilbert Rorison, St. Peter's Church, Peter-		
head, ...	1	
Alexander Ross, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...	1	
James Russell of Aden, ...	1	
Rev. J. G. Ryde, Parsonage, Melrose, ...	1	
Right Rev. The Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld,		
and Dunblane, ...	1	
Rev. Daniel F. Sandford, St. John's Church,		
Edinburgh, ...	1	
Hugh Scott of Gala, ...	1	
Robert Scott, Mossilee, Galashiels, ...	1	
Editor of The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, ...		1
Rev. Alexander Simpson, Parsonage, Lochlee, ...		1
J. Y. Simpson, Professor of Midwifery, Edinburgh, ...	1	
James Augustus Sinclair, Clerk of the Peace for		
Aberdeenshire, ...		1
W. F. Skene, W.S., Edinburgh, ...	1	1
Charles B. Skinner, Merchant, London, ...	1	

	No. of Copies.	
	Fine.	Common.
William Skinner, Advocate, Aberdeen, ...		1
H. Ambrose Smith, Northern Assurance Company, Aberdeen,		1
Very Rev. James Smith, Parsonage, Forgue, ...	1	
John Smith, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1	
John Smith, Alford Place, Aberdeen,		1
William Spence, Bank Agent, New Pitsligo, ...	1	
Rev. Dr. Arthur P. Stanley, Professor of Ecclesi- astical History, Oxford,		1
Rev. William Stephen, St. Luke's Church, Dum- barton,		1
James Steuart, W.S., Edinburgh,	1	
Rev. Dr. William Stevenson, Professor of Ecclesias- tical History, Edinburgh,	1	
Alexander Stewart, Jun., Writer, Huntly, ...	1	
William Stirling of Keir, M.P.,	1	
John Stuart, Secretary of the Society of Anti- quaries of Scotland,	1	1
Rev. George Sutherland, St. Ternan's Church, Banchory,		1
Dr. P. C. Sutherland, Surveyor-General, Natal,	1	
Archibald Campbell Swinton, Professor of Civil Law, Edinburgh,	1	
Rev. Dr. Alexander Taylor, Manse, Leochel Cushnie,		1
R. J. Taylor, Threadneedle Street, London, ...		1
Rev. Alexander Temple, Parsonage, Strathtay,		1
Rev. William Temple, Parsonage, Cuminestown,		1
Alexander Thomson of Banchory,	1	
Mrs. Tireman, Nuston, Tintern,		1
Very Rev. John Torry, Dean of St. Andrews,	1	
William Troup, Pitlochrie,	1	
Right Rev. Bishop Trower, Exeter,	1	
Dr. George Tulloch, Bellevue, Aberdeen, ...	1	
Adam Urquhart, Sheriff of Wigtonshire, ...	1	
Rev. Charles Wagstaff, Vicar of Studham, ...	1	
Charles Walker, Commission Agent, Aberdeen,		1

			No. of Copies.	
			Fine.	Common.
George Walker, Advocate, Aberdeen,	1	
Rev. George Walker, Belford,	1	
Rev. Robert Walker, St. Magnus' Mission, Lerwick,				1
William S. Walker of Bowland,	1	2
William Walker, Wine Merchant, Aberdeen,				1
Rev. William Walker, Parsonage, Monymusk,				1
William Watson, Sheriff-Substitute of Aberdeen-				
shire,	1	
Rev. John Watt, Manse of Fetteresso,	...			1
John Webster, Advocate, Aberdeen,	...	1		
Rev. William Webster, Parsonage, New Pitsligo,		1		
The Lord Wharncliffe,	1	
Rev. John A. White, St. James's Church, Leith,				1
William Whitecross, Crown Street, Aberdeen,				1
Rev. Thomas Wildman, Galloway House, Wigton-				
shire,		1
Rev. T. Wilkinson, one of H. M. Inspectors of				
Schools, Stanwix,	1	
William Williamson, Albyn Place, Aberdeen,		1		
Rev. Archibald Wilson, Greenock,		1
Very Rev. David Wilson, Dean of Aberdeen,				2
John Wilson, Bookseller, Aberdeen,	1	
W. E. Collins Wood of Keithick,	1	
Dr. Edward Woodford, one of H. M. Inspectors of				
Schools, Edinburgh,		1
Rev. Thomas Wyer, St. Peter's Church, Peebles,				1
D. Wyllie & Son, Booksellers, Aberdeen,	...	1		1
William Yeats, Advocate, Aberdeen,	...	1		

2000
100

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01127 2335

